

MOSHEIM'S
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

VOL. I.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

INSTITUTES 667
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,

ANCIENT AND MODERN.

BY
JOHN LAURENCE VON MOSHEIM, D.D.

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GÜTTINGEN.

A LITERAL TRANSLATION FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN, WITH COPIOUS ADDITIONAL
NOTES, ORIGINAL AND SELECTED, BY

JAMES MURDOCK, D.D.

AND

HENRY SOAMES, M.A.

CHANCELLOR OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.

EDITED, AND BROUGHT DOWN TO THE PRESENT TIME, BY

WILLIAM STUBBS, M.A.

VICAR OF NAVESTOCK, AND LIBRARIAN TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY;
LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

IN THREE VOLUMES.


VOL. I.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN; SIMPKIN & Co.; HAMILTON & Co.;
WHITTAKER & Co.; J. & F. H. RIVINGTON; HATCHARD & Co.; SMITH, ELDER, & Co.;
T. & W. BOONE; E. HODGSON; BAGSTER & SONS; HOULSTON & WRIGHT; TEGG &
Co.; WILLIS & SOTHERAN; NISBET & Co.; J. CORNISH; J. SNOW; BICKERS & SON;
STEVENS, SONS, & HAYNES; A. HALL & Co.; VIRTUE BROTHERS & Co.; J. & C.
MOZLEY; ROUTLEDGE & Co.; H. CLEAVER; W. ALLAN & Co.; J. H. & J. PARKER;
W. E. OLIVER; AND E. BUMPUS.

1863.

GEORGE F. MAYCOCK



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

THE
EDITOR'S PREFACE.

JOHANN LORENZ VON MOSHEIM was born at Lübeck, on the 9th of October, 1694. His family was noble, the Freiherren of Mosheim having flourished anciently in Styria and Switzerland. His father, who was in the military service of England, had been converted to the Roman Church; Mosheim, however, was brought up a Protestant. He was educated at Lübeck, at first under private tuition, afterwards at the Gymnasium; thence he proceeded to the University of Kiel, where he took the degree of *Magister* in 1718, and the next year became Assessor to the Philosophical Faculty. Whilst at Kiel, he exhibited his great inclination for the study of Ecclesiastical History, and also began his career as a minister of the Gospel, undertaking for three years the duty of a sick clergyman who had been one of his tutors. In 1723 he was made Professor of Theology at Helmstadt, and took his degree of Doctor of Divinity. It was during his residence at this University that most of his works were composed, and his merits as a preacher and divine became extensively known. In 1747 King George II. made him Professor of Divinity and Chancellor of the University of Göttingen. He died on the 9th of September, 1755.

His publications on Ecclesiastical History and kindred subjects amounted in number to not less than eighty-five. The most famous of these are the *Commentarii de Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum*, and the work before us. The former of these was published at Helmstadt in 1753, and has been translated into English by Mr. Vidal.

The present work, which was intended by Mosheim as a text-book, not, as it has too commonly been used, as a body of Ecclesiastical History, appeared first in two small volumes, in 1737 and 1741. It

was republished with large additions and improvements, in one volume quarto, Helmstadt, 1755, the year of the author's death.

It was translated in 1764, from Latin into English, by Dr. Archibald Maclaine, a Presbyterian minister at the Hague; it was also translated into Dutch and French. It was published in German, with biographical notes, by J. A. C. von Einem, in 1769; and between 1770 and 1780 by J. R. Schlegel, Rector of the Gymnasium of Heilbronn, with extensive notes of a critical, philosophical, and historical character.

Dr. Maclaine's English edition acquired a certain degree of popularity, owing no doubt in a great measure to the fact that it supplied an acknowledged hiatus in our literature. A compendious Church History, in English, for the use of those who have neither time nor means to consult original authorities, is still almost as great a desideratum as it was a century ago. The faults of that translation are, however, very glaring; the theological opinions of Maclaine were not those of Mosheim, who was a strong Lutheran; the calm and careful moderation of the original language was exchanged 'for the flippant language of an *esprit fort*,'¹ and the tone of the book materially damaged. In 1832, Dr. James Murdock, of New Haven, in the United States of America, published a new translation, in which he adhered faithfully to the Latin text. He introduced, moreover, very copious notes from Schlegel and Von Einem, and of his own. The English edition of 1841, by Mr. Soames, consisted of Dr. Murdock's translation and notes; with additional chapters on the History of the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland, notes, and a continuation from 1750 to the year of publication, from the pen of the editor. In the subsequent edition of 1850, Mr. Soames, retaining Dr. Murdock's notes, made very considerable alterations in the text, intended to bring it to a closer identity with Mosheim's Latin.

In the present edition, the text of the last edition by Mr. Soames is retained: the notes of Dr. Murdock, of Schlegel, and of Mr. Soames are corrected with some very slight retrenchment; a few occasional notes and a chapter in continuation have been added by the Editor.

The idea of an Ecclesiastical History which Mosheim has drawn

¹ Dowling, *Introduction to the Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History*, p. 194.

for us in his Introduction may be considered to have been realised in the present work. It possesses all the excellences which he desired in such a book, and shows the author to have been endowed with all the powers that he himself looked upon as qualifying a man for such an undertaking. He was learned, eloquent, industrious, calm, and fair in all his judgments where his own few prepossessions did not interfere; acute in tracing events to their causes, and well acquainted with the motives that ordinarily influence mankind. And these characteristics appear everywhere in his Church History. It is true that occasionally a rhetorical flourish on the subject of the iniquities of popes and bishops, or a hasty generalisation as to the ignorance of particular ages and bodies of men, strikes us as unworthy of the learning and calmness of the ideal he proposed to himself; but it will be generally found that such generalities are corrected in detail, and that, on points on which he has thought it desirable to condescend to minute criticisms, his determinations are singularly fair, clear, and satisfactory.

It cannot, however, escape the notice of the Christian reader that the book lacks one ingredient at least that he might expect to find there. It seems strange that in writing a history of that faith on the maintenance of which we believe the salvation of our souls to depend, of the communion of the saints who hold it, and of those vicissitudes which have combined to represent it to our minds in that complexion in which we receive it, the writer should have striven, as Mosheim apparently has done, to write without any show of spiritual feeling. It would certainly be wrong to suppose that he was a stranger to such feelings. That he was capable of expressing them is clear from the character which he enjoyed as a preacher in Germany all his life. It is probable that, under a mistaken view of the importance of a judicial opinion, he purposely wrote as one who viewed the Christian Church as it were from a point of view exterior to itself. It would be curious to find a man undertaking to write the History of Poetry, and at the same time carefully smothering in his diction any spark of poetic taste or fervour with which Nature may have gifted him. Yet Mosheim appears to have done so. It is true, the book was intended but for a text-book, and so gave no opportunity for any display of religious enthusiasm; it is not, however, the necessary absence of that of which we complain, but the

seemingly forced exclusion of any but the coldest and most dispassionate view of any subject whatever.

But although this deficiency gives us no right to think of Mosheim as a lukewarm Christian, his treatment of the early Fathers, and of the controversies on the nature of the Trinity and the Incarnation, is such as to lead us to imagine him to have been unfortunately blind to the vast importance of the points involved. He frequently treats as mere verbal disputes, questions on subjects of whose importance even the historical result of those disputes leaves no possible doubt. And his treatment of the champions of the Truth is coloured by the same fault. He looks frequently on them, not as men whose whole being and hope of salvation were involved in the belief of the Perfect Deity of the Son of God who had died to redeem them, but as mere partisans blinded to the merits of their adversary's cause by obstinate attachment to their own prejudices.

With this single drawback, the novice in Ecclesiastical History will find in Mosheim all that he has a right to look for. 'His philosophical mind gave to Church History the form and method of a science, and his works on the subject exhibit a range of erudition, an accuracy of statement, and comprehensive views, which command the most profound respect, while they breathe withal a spirit of candour and moderation which scarcely allows us to withhold from him esteem and confidence.'¹ Still it must be remembered that the book is hardly more than a syllabus of a vast subject: fulness of detail and appreciation of character are not to be expected from it; in default of these, it has one great merit, that it can never be used as a cram-book. A man who reads it carefully, and with industrious recourse to the abundant authorities referred to by the author, cannot well rise from the study without a just and accurate, if not an adequate, notion of Church History.

The notes subjoined to the text by Dr. Murdock (marked *Tr.*) and Schlegel (marked *Schl.*) are valuable as containing illustrations and details, not as giving the judgments of men of much historical learning. In fact, what few expressions of opinion occur in them are one-sided, and not to be received by a member of the Church of England as of more importance than the opinions of an American Presbyterian or a German Illuminist would be likely to carry. The

¹ Dowling.

criticisms on the value of the writings of the Fathers and medieval divines are superficial, and the writers are not free from the charge of looking on questions of literary criticism with the eyes of partisans. In particular, some of the notes on the Epistles of Clement and Ignatius are dictated by a simple foregone conclusion against Episcopacy. Notwithstanding, these notes show a great deal of reading, and are very convenient: they add considerably to the value of Mosheim's work as a book of reference, and at the same time make it impossible to look upon it (as there is some danger of its being regarded by beginners) as a full and continuous History of the Church.

The notes (marked *S.*) and additions made to the work by my late venerable friend Mr. Soames are very valuable. The notes bear testimony to a careful, patient, and candid investigation of the points they touch upon; and the additional chapters are written in a spirit of fairness and impartiality which nowhere loses sight of the important fact that truth and falsehood are vitally opposed to one another. Whilst he is fair to opponents, never counting them answerable for such consequences of their actions as they did not actually contemplate, he nowhere overstates his own side of any question, or condescends to the meanness of representing those not holding the same opinions as himself as influenced by low, unworthy motives.

The field occupied so long by Mosheim's Church History now contains many industrious and able workers. He himself founded that eminent school to which belonged the Walchs and Schroeckh, to whose works the notes of Dr. Murdock contain so many references. The later works of Gieseler and Neander are very valuable in the same department; the former, however, is too rationalistic, and the latter, though learnedly pious and eloquent, too much affected by the influences that have corrupted the better German theology of the day, to be safely trusted in the hands of the young. I have not thought it necessary to make any reference to Dean Milman's noble work on Latin Christianity, which must be read for itself, and as a whole; and in the few places in which Canon Robertson's very valuable Church History is referred to, I have only used it as giving the latest decisions of sound historical critics on points on which the judgments of the annotators have been superseded on further information. It

will be seen how very seldom the judgments of Mosheim himself have been improved upon.

The corrections and slight alterations in the notes are principally in matters of names and dates. The references to particular books are generally left as the annotators made them. I am apprehensive that, notwithstanding an immense number of clerical errors that are corrected in this edition, many more may have escaped my eye. It is a fault almost necessary to a book that has passed through so many hands, and it is not always easy to say what a clerical error is.

In the concluding chapter, I have tried to present the reader with a fair view of the state of the Church since 1830. No one can be more sensible of the defects of this portion of the work than I am myself. Still there is some excuse for them. It is almost impossible to write ever so scanty a sketch of the events we have ourselves lived in without giving too much importance to those which have most impressed us. It is almost impossible to write without some bias; and it seems to me more honest to let that bias be seen than to attempt to write as if one had none, or was unconscious of it. An English Churchman cannot, and ought not to try to, write a Church History in the tone of a heathen. His tone ought to be that of a Christian, 'rejoicing not in iniquity, but rejoicing in the Truth;' never sparing the heresy, however much he may sympathize with the good points or feel for the misfortunes of the heresiarch. The infallibility of the sceptic is worth little, either in Divinity or in History.

It might seem desirable that the History of the Eighteenth Century should in this work have been now thrown into uniformity with Mosheim's plan of the earlier centuries. I have not ventured to do this, chiefly because so much of the documentary history of that century remains yet unpublished. It is time that this ceased to be the case—certainly with regard to the English Church. There exist large collections of letters and memoirs of the period in different repertories of manuscripts which, if published, would not only give a much fairer account of the times than the ex-parte statements of ephemeral writers have hitherto given, but would set in their true pre-eminence the really great men of the age, in preference to those who are famous only because they fell into the hands of good biographers. How little is known of the labours of

Wake and Gibson! Even Burnet himself owes his existence as a standard historian almost to accident.

I have not thought it necessary to burden the last chapter with long lists of authorities. The three writers most frequently referred to are Gieseler, Ritter, and Döllinger. Of these, Gieseler was a Rationalist, the other two Romanists. Of course they are only authorities for matters of fact. All three exhibit the most consummate ignorance of everything connected with the English Church. Döllinger, in particular, seems to have taken his notion of it, partly from the misrepresentations of Dissenting periodicals, partly from the almost equally fallacious statements of discontented members of it, who, whatever credit may be deserved by their sincerity, should remember, in their exaggerated complaints of the faults of the system to which they owe under God their spiritual life, that they ought not to give an adversary occasion to speak evil of it. Döllinger's picture of the Church of England has not even truth enough to render it a poor caricature.

I have thought it best to retain Wake's Correspondence with Dupin in the Appendix, because the letters, though mutilated and partly garbled, are not accessible elsewhere. The argument of Maclaine was better discarded. It is certainly desirable that the custodians of the correspondence should now at length give it to the world in its integrity.

NAVESTOCK :
August 23, 1863.

THE

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

My *Institutes of Christian History*¹ having been long out of print, the worthy person at whose expense they were published, has often requested me to give a new edition of them, somewhat improved and enlarged. This request I for many years resisted; for I was reluctant to suspend other works, then on my hands, which I deemed more important; besides, I must acknowledge that I shrank from the task of supplying corrections and needful additions to a book in which I myself saw numerous deficiencies. But importunities, from the publisher, and from some learned men who joined with him, at length overcame my backwardness: and now, after the leisure hours of two years have been spent on the work, it is brought to a close. My *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History* make, however, their appearance, not only in a new form and dress, but likewise changed so materially, as to be almost entirely a new work.

The distribution of materials into certain classes, which I deemed before most convenient for learners, I could not make up my mind to remove; although reasons have occurred to me for preferring a continuous and unbroken narrative. But some excellent men told me that they had found the former method very useful, and this has made me determine upon retaining it. A little reflexion will, indeed, convince us, that whoever would embrace in a single book all things needful for knowing the state of Christianity in every age, must adopt a certain principle of classification and distribution. I have, accordingly, left the form of my work unchanged, and have thought only of its correction, improvement, and enlargement, so as to render it more fit for use.

My principal care has been to relate events with fidelity and authority. For this purpose I have gone to the very sources of information—the best writers, that is, of all ages, and such as lived

¹ [A work in 2 vols. 12mo, first published in 1737—41; and afterwards abridged by J. P. Miller, in 1 vol. 12mo, Hamb. 1752. Tr.]

in, or near, the times which they treat of; consulting them with attention, and expressing in brief, clear, nervous language, what I found written by them. Those who write summaries of history, commonly do no more than abridge the more voluminous historians: and this method I myself before pursued to a considerable degree. This is a practice that has its advantages, and cannot be wholly condemned; but it is attended with this evil, that it perpetuates the mistakes, which are apt to abound in very large and voluminous works, by causing them to pass from a single book into numerous others. I had long known this from numberless instances, but I felt it again with considerable mortification when I brought the light of testimony from the best authorities to shine on the pages of my own work. I now perceived that writers pre-eminent for their diligence and fidelity are not always to be trusted; and found that I had abundant occasion for adding, expunging, changing, and correcting in every part of my book. In performing this task, I know that I have not been wanting in patience and industry, or in watchfulness and care; but whether these guides have secured me against all mistakes, which is confessedly of no easy accomplishment, I leave *them* to judge who are best informed in ecclesiastical affairs. To aid persons disposed for such inquiries, I have, in general, made distinct reference to my authorities; and if I have perverted their testimony either by misstatement or misapplication, I confess myself to be less excusable than other transgressors in this way, because I had before me all the authors whom I quote, and I turned them over, and read and compared them with each other, being resolved to follow solely their guidance.

This desire of exhibiting history in its purity and integrity—that is, as it appears in authors whose authority cannot be contemned—has caused many and various changes and additions throughout my work; but nowhere more, or more conspicuously, than in the *Third Book*, which details the affairs of Christians, especially of the Latins, from Charlemagne to the time when Luther reformed religion. This period of ecclesiastical history, though it embraces great events, and is very important on account of the light it casts on the origin and causes of the present civil and religious state of Europe, thereby enabling us correctly to estimate and judge of many things that occur in our own times, has not hitherto been treated with the same neatness, perspicuity, and solidity as the other parts of church history. Here the number of original writers is great; yet few of them are in common use, or are of easy acquisition: they all frighten us, either with their bulk, the barbarity of their style, or their excessive price:

not a few of them, either knowingly or ignorantly, corrupt the truth, or, at least, obscure it by their ignorance and unskilfulness; and some of them have not yet been published. It is not strange, therefore, that many things in this part of ecclesiastical history should be either passed over in silence, or be less happily stated and explained, even by the most laborious and learned authors. Among these, the ecclesiastical annalists, and the historians of the monastic sects, so famous in the Roman church, as *Baronius*, *Raynaldi*, *Bzovius*, *Manriquez*, *Wadding*, and others, though richly supplied with ancient manuscripts and records, have often committed more faults, and fallen into greater mistakes, than writers far inferior to them in learning, reputation, and means of information. Having, therefore, bestowed much attention, during many years, on the history of the church from the eighth century onwards, and believing that I had obtained, from works published or still in manuscript, a better and more correct knowledge of many events than is given in the common accounts of those times, I conceived that I might do service to the cause of ecclesiastical history, by exhibiting to the world some of the results of my investigations; and that, by throwing some light on the obscure period of the middle ages, I might excite men of talents and industry to pursue the same object, and thus to perfect the history of the Latin church. I persuade myself, that I have brought forward some things which are new, or before little known; that other things, which had been stated incorrectly or obscurely, I have here exhibited with clearness, and traced back to the proper authorities; and—claiming the indulgence allowed an old man, to boast a little—that some things, which were accredited fables, I have now exploded. Whether I deceive myself in all this, or not, the discerning reader may ascertain, by examining, and comparing with the common accounts, what I have said respecting Constantine's donation, the *Cathari* and Albigenses, the Beghards and Beguines, the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit (that pest to many parts of Europe during four centuries), and of the *Fratricelli* [or Little Brethren], the controversies of the Franciscan order with the Roman pontiffs, Berengarius's case, the Lollards, and several other subjects.

If, in these enlargements of ecclesiastical history, and while giving views either partially or wholly new, I had used the same brevity as on the subjects well stated and explained by many before me, I should neither have satisfied the inquisitive reader, nor have done justice to myself. For many would have regarded *me* as a writer of fables; and *their* conceptions on these subjects would have been indistinct, useless, and fallacious. Therefore, when I have departed

widely from the common statements, or advanced apparent novelties, I have not only aimed to be explicit, but also, in order to give credibility to my narration, I have gone into more ample disquisitions and citations of authorities; because full statements and demonstrations, though out of place in an *epitome* of history, were here indispensable.

In addition to these causes for changing materially the character and swelling the size of my book, another occurred soon after I commenced its revision. I had before designed my work, especially, for *lecturers* on church history, who need a compendious text for the basis of their instructions; and had, therefore, only touched upon many things as openings for enlargement and explanation in the course of tuition. But when I began to recast, revise, and correct the work, I thought it likely to be better received in many quarters, and to be of more use in the learned world, if it were adapted not merely for teachers, but also for those who, without a teacher, wish to gain a general knowledge of Christian affairs. This opinion had no sooner been formed, than it set me upon supplying omissions, explaining more at large what had been rather obscure, and rearranging many things so as to place them in a clearer light. Hence it is, that in describing the calamities undergone by the Christians of the first ages, more pains than usual are taken to state precisely the truth; and in tracing the origin and progress of the sects which disturbed the church, great accuracy is attempted; so, likewise, the innovations in religion, devised by those who love new things, are calmly and candidly described with all possible fidelity; and religious contests and disputes are more clearly stated, and the arguments more carefully weighed, than before; and the history of the Roman pontiffs after the times of Charlemagne, their wars, and their various enterprises, have received more careful attention. I mention these only as specimens of what has been attempted for the advantage of those who cannot pursue a regular course of church history, from their want of books or leisure, and yet wish to obtain clear and correct views of the principal facts and transactions. The book may be safely trusted, for the most part, by such readers: and it will afford them as much knowledge as will satisfy one that reads only for practical purposes; and, besides, will direct to the authors from whom more full information may be obtained.

It would be folly, and betray ignorance of human imperfection, if I should suppose that no errors *could* be detected, and that nothing needed correction in all the details of so large a history; yet, conscious of my own integrity and good faith, and of the pains I have

taken to avoid mistakes, I cannot but hope that I have rarely ^{so} failed, as that serious evils will result from my errors.

I could add some other prefatory remarks, which would, perhaps, not be useless; but nothing more need be added to enable those to judge correctly of the present work who will be candid and ingenuous and who are competent judges in such matters. I therefore conclude by offering the just tribute of my gratitude to Almighty God, who has given me strength, amidst the infirmities of age and the pressure of other labours and cares, to surmount the difficulties, and bear the fatigue, of completing the work now given to the public.

GÖTTINGEN :
March 23, 1755.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.



Editor's Preface	PAGE v
Author's Preface	xiii
Introduction	1

CENTURY I.

	PAGE		PAGE
State of the Roman Empire	11	Also by Jews in foreign countries	42
Its evils and advantages	11, 12	Divine judgments on the Jews	43
Other nations	13	Ten pagan persecutions	ib.
Paganism	ib.	Roman laws against Christianity	ib.
Of little moral efficacy	16	Causes of hostility to them	44
The Roman and Grecian religions	17	Slanders against Christians	45
Religions beyond the Roman empire	ib.	Martyrs and confessors	ib.
Philosophy deficient in moral efficacy	18	Nero's persecution	47
Epicureans and Academics	ib.	Domitian's	49
Aristotelians	19	Defective knowledge of Eastern philo- sophy	51
Stoics	ib.	Its general tenor productive of Gnos- ticism	52
Platonies	ib.	Jewish philosophy	56
Eclectics	20	State of learning in various countries	57
Herod the Great	22	Teachers of the church	ib.
State of the Jews	ib.	Constitution of the primitive church	59
Corruption of their religion	23	Episcopacy in the first century	62
Their three principal sects	24	Independence of churches	64
Their traditions	25	Canon of the New Testament	ib.
Their toleration	26	Apocryphal writings	65
The Essenes and Therapeutæ	ib.	Clemens Romanus	66
Low state of popular religion	28	Ignatius of Antioch	68
The <i>Cabbala</i>	ib.	Polycarp, Barnabas, and Hermas	69
Pagan adulterations of Judaism	29	Character of the apostolic fathers	70
The Samaritans	ib.	Christian faith and morals	ib.
Jews in foreign countries	30	Mode of teaching Christianity	71
The life of Jesus Christ	ib.	The Apostles' Creed	ib.
The Apostles and the seventy disciples	32	Catechumens and the faithful	73
Fame of Christ out of Judæa	33	Christian schools and academies	ib.
His death, resurrection, and ascension	34	Secret doctrine	74
Inspiration, and first preaching of the Apostles	35	Lives and characters of Christians	ib.
Election of a new apostle	36	Excommunication	75
Conversion of St. Paul	ib.	Controversies among Christians	ib.
The primitive church of Jerusalem	ib.	Judaizing Christians	76
Missions of the Apostles	37	Sacraments appointed by Christ	77
Respect for Christ among pagans	39	Rites of apostolic institution	ib.
Causes of the success of Christianity	40	Jewish rites retained	78
Fictitious causes	41	The Christian Sabbath	ib.
Christians persecuted in Palestine	42		

CENTURY I. (*continued*).

	PAGE		PAGE
Places of religious meeting	79	The Gnostics	83
Mode of worship	ib.	Dositheus	86
The Eucharist and <i>agapæ</i>	80	Simon Magus	ib.
Baptism	ib.	Menander	89
Unction of the Sick	81	The Nicolaitans	ib.
Fasts	ib.	Cerinthus and the Cerinthians	90
Sects in the apostolic age	82	Nazarenes and Ebionites	92
Their gradual increase	83		

CENTURY II.

Character of the Roman emperors	93	Ecclesiastical writers	117
Propagation of Christianity	94	Gradual corruption of Christianity	124
Scriptural versions	98	Rise of ascetic principles	128
<i>Apologies</i> for the Christians	ib.	Deception for the sake of religion	130
Miraculous powers	99	Increase of ceremonies	132
The Thundering Legion	100	The Paschal Controversy	135
Jewish insurrection under Bar-Chochebas	102	Administration of the Lord's Supper	137
Persecution under Trajan	103	Administration of Baptism	ib.
Persecution under Adrian	ib.	The Nazarenes	139
Favourable edict of Antoninus Pius	104	The Ebionites	140
Renewed persecution under Antoninus the Philosopher	105	The Elcesaites	141
Martyrdoms of Polycarp and Justin	ib.	Saturninus	142
Persecutions of Lyons and Vienne	ib.	The Marcionites	143
Persecution under Severus	106	Bardesanes and Tatian	144
Literary attacks upon Christianity	109	Egyptian Gnostics	145
The new Platonics	ib.	Basilides	ib.
The Eclectics	ib.	Carpocrates	147
Ammonius Saccas	110	The Valentinians	148
His principles injurious to Christianity	114	Minor Gnostic sects	150
Episcopal system completely organized	115	The Ophites, or Serpentians	ib.
Councils brought into use	ib.	The Patripassians	152
Metropolitans and Patriarchs	116	The Artemonites	ib.
A Christian Hierarchy formed on the Jewish model	ib.	Hermogenes	153
		The Montanists	ib.

CENTURY III.

Improved condition of the Christians	157	Origin of mysticism	184
Labours of Origen	159	Zeal for the diffusion of Scripture	185
Conversion of the Goths	160	Prevailing errors in controversy	189
Establishment of churches in Gaul and Germany	ib.	Expectation of the Millennium	191
Persecution under Maximin	161	The baptism of heretics	192
Persecution under Decius	162	Contest respecting Origen	193
Succeeding persecutions	163	Increase of religious ceremonies	194
Improved condition of the Christians	164	Baptismal usages	195
Platonic tampering with Christianity	ib.	Stated fasts and times of prayer	196
Decay of learning	166	Manes and the Manichæans	198
Precedence conceded to the Roman see	168	The Hieracites	203
Minor orders established	170	Noëtus and the Patripassians	204
Prejudices in favour of clerical celibacy	171	Sabellius	205
Origen	172	Beryllus of Bostra	206
Cyprian	177	Paul of Samosata	207
Less distinguished writers	179	The Arabian sect	208
Platonic theology	182	Novatian and Novatus	ib.

CENTURY IV.

	PAGE		PAGE
Peaceful state of the church	213	Jerome's version of Scripture	268
Persecution of Diocletian	214	Literary defects of the age	271
Conversion of Constantine	218	Rise of Monachism	272
His vision of the Cross	221	Pious frauds and intolerance	275
Persecution of Licinius	223	The Meletians	276
Julian the Apostate	225	The Eustathians	277
Subsequent prosperity of the church	228	The Luciferians	278
Literary attacks upon Christianity	229	Aërius	279
Establishment of the Armenian church	231	Jovinian's opposition to Asceticism	280
Conversion of Abyssinia	232	Origenism	281
Conversion of Georgia	ib.	Pagan usages ingrafted on Christianity	282
Establishment of the Gothic church	ib.	Origin of ecclesiastical patronage	283
Martin of Tours	233	Diversities in religious worship	284
Persecution of Sapor, king of Persia	234	Observation of Sunday and festivals	285
Increasing literature of the Christians	236	Fasting	286
The first council of Nice	239	Erection of baptisteries	ib.
Augmented power of the bishops	ib.	Rise of masses for the dead	287
Correspondence of the ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions	242	The Donatists	289
Pre-eminence of the Roman see	ib.	The <i>Circumcelliones</i>	290
A secondary rank given to that of Constantinople	244	Rise and progress of Arianism	293
Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian	245	The first council of Nice	297
Athanasius	247	Athanasius	303
Basil	ib.	Various fortunes of Arianism	304
Chrysostom	249	Minor Arian sects	306
Lactantius	256	Apollinaris and the Apollinarians	308
Ambrose	257	Marcellus	309
Jerome	ib.	Photinus	310
Augustine	258	Macedonius	311
Rufinus	260	The Priscillianists	313
Latin writers of less note	262	Audæus	315
Increase of Pagan usages and principles	266	The Messalians, or Euchites	316
		The Antidico-Marianites and Collyridians	317

CENTURY V.

Laws against Paganism	320	Banishment and death of Chrysostom	359
Extension of the Oriental church	ib.	Institution of the Rogation days	360
Conversion of German tribes	321	Abolition of the <i>agapæ</i>	ib.
Conversion of the Franks	322	Origin of auricular confession	361
Conversion of Ireland	323	Persecution of the Donatists	362
Opposition of the Pagans	325	Arian persecution of the Catholics	361
Persian persecution	326	Nestorius and the Nestorians	365
Decline of solid learning	328	The council of Ephesus	367
Incipient popularity of Aristotle	330	Barsumas	371
The patriarchal sees	331	Eutyches	373
Degeneracy of the clergy	335	The council of Chalcedon	375
Increase of monastic importance	336	Peter the Fuller	376
Ecclesiastical writers	337	Zeno's <i>Henoticon</i>	377
Rise of the invocation of saints	350	Division of the Monophysites	ib.
Rise of a belief in purgatory	351	Pelagius and Pelagianism	379
Progress of Mysticism	355	Rise of a belief in reprobation	383
Pillar-Saints	356	Semi-Pelagianism	385
Vigilantius against prevailing corruptions	357		

CENTURY VI.

	PAGE		PAGE
Conversions of barbarous nations . . .	389	Progress of doctrinal corruption . . .	417
Jews induced to profess Christianity . .	391	Biblical expositors	418
Paganism yet entertained by men of learning	392	The three forms of theology	419
Barbarian hostility to Christianity . .	394	Lives of saints	ib.
Monastic services to literature	396	Tenacity of Origen's popularity . . .	420
Decline of solid learning	397	The three chapters	421
Platonic philosophy supplanted by Aris- totelian	398	The canon of the mass	425
Rival sees of Rome and Constantinople .	399	Increase of festivals	ib.
Rival bishops of Rome	401	Extinction of the Donatists	427
Increasing popularity of Monachism . .	402	Overthrow of Arian establishments . .	ib.
Benedict of Nursia	403	Establishment of the Nestorians . . .	ib.
The Benedictines	405	Establishment of the Monophysites . .	429
Ecclesiastical writers	406	New disputes about the body of Christ	430
		Tritheism	431

CENTURY VII.

Introduction of Christianity into China .	433	Ecclesiastical writers	451
Augustine's mission to England	434	Increase of superstition	456
Missions to the Netherlands and Ger- many	435	Decline of sound theology	458
Conversion of England	439	<i>Concilium quinisextum</i> (the seventh general)	460
Mahumed	442	Mahumedanism favourable to Oriental heresy	463
Western literature chiefly monastic . .	446	Monothelism	464
Continued rivalry between Rome and Constantinople	448	The sixth general council	467
Ecclesiastical independence of Gaul and Spain	449	The Maronites	469
		The council in <i>Trullo</i> or <i>Quinisext</i> . .	470

CENTURY VIII.

Christianity propagated in Tartary . . .	475	Charlemagne's liberality to the papacy .	491
Mission of Boniface to Germany	476	Constantine's pretended grant	492
Conversion of the Saxons, by means of Charlemagne	479	Grecian hostility to papal greatness . .	493
Rise of the Turkish power	481	Canons instituted	494
Establishment of the Moors in Spain . .	482	Imperial power over the popes	495
Progress of Aristotelian philosophy . .	483	Ecclesiastical writers	496
Intellectual eminence of the British Isles	484	Increasing value for religious externals	503
Cathedral and monastic schools	ib.	Systematic theology taught among the Greeks	506
Pecuniary commutations of penance . .	487	Controversy on the worship of images . .	507
Temporal rank given to the church . .	ib.	Second council of Nice	511
Excommunication aided by Druidic prejudice	488	Controversy on the procession of the Holy Ghost	513
Pepin's usurpation aided by the pope . .	489	Multiplication of religious ceremonies .	ib.
		Sect of the Adoptionists	517

CENTURY IX.

Conversion of Scandinavia	519	Learning cultivated by the Arabians . .	527
Mission of Methodius and Cyril	521	Literary efforts of the West	528
Conversion of Dalmatia and Russia . . .	522	The times unfavourable to sound reli- gion	531
Power and success of the Saracens . . .	523	The alleged papess, Joanna	532
Progress of the Normans	524		

CENTURY IX. (*continued*).

	PAGE		PAGE
Augmented power of the popes	533	Renewed controversy on the double	
The decretal epistles	535	procession	560
Popularity of Monachism	536	The eucharistic controversy	ib.
Canons and canonesses	538	Godeschalc and the predestinarian con-	
Ecclesiastical writers	539	trovery	563
Intellectual decline after Charlemagne	550	Brief controversy upon Tritheism . . .	567
Eagerness for saintly protection . . .	551	Minor controversies	ib.
Canonization	ib.	Separation between the Greeks and	
Passion for relics	553	Latins	568
State of biblical learning	ib.	Rise of Ritualists	571
Renewal of the iconoclastic controversy	557	Ordeals	572
Establishment of image-worship . . .	559	The Paulicians	574
Claudius of Turin	ib.		

CENTURY X.

Nestorian conversions	579	Extreme degeneracy of the popes . . .	594
Prester John	580	Increase of the papal power	598
Conversion of the Franco-Normans . .	ib.	Ecclesiastical acquisitions of civil pri-	
Conversion of Poland	581	vileges	599
Re-conversion of Russia	ib.	Concubinage and simony	600
Permanent success of Christianity in		The Cluniac order	ib.
Hungary	582	Ecclesiastical writers	601
Conversion of Denmark	583	Increase of superstition	605
Conversion of Norway	ib.	Canonization begun by the popes . . .	607
Progress of Christianity in Germany .	584	The Festival of All Souls	609
First projects of a crusade	585	Worship of the Virgin Mary	610
The Turks converted to Mahomedanism	586	Heretical movements	611
European pagans hostile to Christianity	ib.	POPES	615
Extreme pressure of ignorance	588	PRINCIPAL COUNCILS	619
Sylvester II.	592	ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY	621
Clerical degeneracy	593	ARCHBISHOPS OF ARMAGH	622

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Ecclesiastical History defined — § 2. Its divisions — § 3. The external history of the Church — § 4. Which treats of the prosperous — § 5. and the adverse events — § 6. The internal history — § 7. Which treats of (i) Ministers — § 8, 9. (ii) Doctrines — § 10. (iii) Worship — § 11. (iv) Heresies — § 12. Events must be traced to their causes — § 13. Means of discovering these causes, general — § 14. and particular; in the external — § 15. and internal history — § 16. The sources of ecclesiastical history — § 17. Qualities of the historian — § 18. He must be free from all prejudices — § 19. Faults of historians — § 20. Uses of ecclesiastical history, general — § 21. and special — § 22, 23. Method in ecclesiastical history; division into periods — § 24. Distribution under heads.

§ 1. THE *Ecclesiastical History of the New Dispensation* is a clear and faithful narrative of those affairs which either have happened from without to that society of men which takes its name from Christ, or have been transacted within its own body. In this, events are so connected with their causes, that men may both see God's providence in establishing and preserving it, and grow not less in piety than in wisdom.

§ 2. It can scarcely be better and more perfectly placed under view than by considering the company of men which we mentioned, as a state ruled by certain laws and institutions under a regular government. To such a state many things must happen from without, which either make for its interest, or are against it; and since nothing human is stable, many things must occur in its own bosom which change its character. Hence its history is most conveniently distributed into the *external* and the *internal*. The same principle of division will apply to the history of the Christian commonwealth, if care be taken to leave out nothing that seems likely to be useful.

§ 3. The branch called *external* is properly the history of the Christian people, that is, of those who make up Christ's body politic: since it embraces all the changes and vicissitudes of that holier among commonwealths, which fall under observation. All bodies of people, however, now meet with prosperous fates, now, in turn, with adverse: nor have Christians had a different fortune. Hence this part of ecclesiastical history is fitly divided into an account of the *prosperous*, and of the *calamitous*, events which Christians have experienced.

§ 4. The *prosperous* and *favourable* fates by which the Christian commonwealth has gained importance and extent, have come either

from its heads and officers, or from the general body of its members. Heads of the Christian people may be parted into *public* and *private*. The former are kings, magistrates, pontiffs: the latter, teachers, men of learning, weight, and influence. Both have contributed much, at every time, to the body's increase. Great men, by their authority, laws, benefits, nay more, by arms, have both strengthened and enlarged the commonwealth. Teachers and men renowned for learning, genius, holiness, and virtue, by fearless and famous deeds, by their travels, books, and influence, have recommended with wonderful success the religion that came from Christ, to those who knew it not. Even the Christian populace, by faith, constancy, piety, and love towards God and men, has brought many to subject themselves to Christ.

§ 5. In like manner, the *adverse* fates, on which Christians have fallen, have happened either from the fault of individuals among themselves, or from the hatred and insidious acts of enemies to their religion. That Christians themselves, especially governors of the flock, by negligence, ill-directed exertions, quarrels, and contentions, have stirred up many evils to the people, is testified most abundantly. Enemies of Christ's kingdom, again, are either *public*, or *private*. The *public*, that is, kings and magistrates, by laws and penalties, have obstructed the progress of Christianity. The *private*, I mean philosophers, people infected with superstitions, and contemners of all religion, have assailed it with criminations, artifices, and books.

§ 6. The *internal history* of the Christian state treats of the changes, to which the church in every age has been exposed, in regard to its distinguishing characteristics, as a religious society. It may, not unsuitably, be called the *history of the Christian religion*. The causes of these internal changes are found, for the most part, in those who have exercised authority over the society. These often so interpret the laws of faith and practice, as either fancy bids, or interest requires. Should the bulk of their people prove acquiescent and obedient, yet some will occasionally resist, and give birth to seditions and civil wars. To all these subjects the intelligent ecclesiastical historian must direct his attention.

§ 7. The first subject, in the internal history of the church, is the *history of its rulers*, and of its government. Originally the teachers and the people conjointly ruled the Christian commonwealth. But these teachers, in process of time, assumed a loftier spirit, and, trampling on the rights of the people, claimed sovereign power, both in sacred and secular affairs. At last, things gradually came to this, that one person held supreme power over the whole church; or, at least, affected to hold it.—Among these governors and guides of the church, some obtained by their writings preeminent fame and influence; and as these were by after-ages regarded as oracles and masters, they deserve especial mention among directors of Christian affairs, although sometimes they were not intrusted with any share in the administration of them.

§ 8. The *history of the laws* by which the sacred commonwealth is governed, necessarily follows that of its teachers. The laws peculiar to the Christian community are of two kinds. Some are *divine*, proceeding from God himself: these are written in those books which Christians very properly believe to be divinely inspired. Others are *human*, and came from governors of the community. The former are usually called *doctrines*; and are divided into two classes, namely, *doctrines of faith*, which govern the understanding, and *moral doctrines*, which control the will.

§ 9. In the history of these laws or *doctrines*, the first thing for observation is, how the book itself of heavenly jurisprudence has been regarded and expounded among Christians, from age to age. For in every period, the state of religion itself has depended on the divine book's authority, or the fashion of interpreting it. Then we have to show what happened to God's ordinances and laws, how they were handled and explained, defended against enemies, at length vitiated and corrupted. Our last matter for consideration is how far Christians obeyed the divine injunctions, or how they lived; nor should we overlook the laws by which rulers sought to restrain the petulance and vices of their people.

§ 10. The *human laws* of which we speak, are prescriptions relating to the external worship of God, or religious rites, whether derived from custom, or from positive enactment. Rites either *directly* appertain to religion, or *indirectly* refer to it. The former embrace the whole exterior of religious *worship*, both public and private. The latter include everything, except direct worship, that is accounted religious and proper. This part of religious history is very extensive; partly from the variety, and partly from the frequent changes, in ceremonies. A concise history can, therefore, but briefly touch upon it, not accurately treat it.

§ 11. As, in civil commonwealths, wars and seditions sometimes break out, so in the Christian state no light stirrings have been often made, both on account of doctrines and of rites. The leaders and authors of these seditions are called *heretics*; and the opinions for which they separated from other Christians, are called *heresies*. The history of these commotions or heresies, should be full and precise. This labour, if wisely expended, and with impartiality, will well repay the toil: but it is arduous and difficult. For the leaders of these parties have been treated with much injustice; and their doctrines are misrepresented: nor is it easy to come at the truth in the midst of so much darkness; since most of the writings of those called *heretics* are now lost. Those, therefore, who approach this part of church history, should exclude everything invidious from the name *heretic*: and consider it as used only in a more general sense for a man, who, by his own, or by another's fault, has given occasion for wars and disagreements among Christians.

§ 12. He who would handle this history, both externally and internally, so as to be useful, must not only tell *what was done*, but also *why this or that thing happened*, that is, *events* are to be joined

with their *causes*. He who narrates naked facts, only furnishes the memory and amuses readers; but he who adds reasons to the deeds, profits them besides, both sharpening their discriminating powers, and rendering them wise. Yet it must be confessed, that caution is here necessary, lest we fabricate causes, and unwarrantably make men, long since dead, responsible for our own waking dreams.

§ 13. In exploring the causes of events, besides *testimonies* themselves, of those engaged in them, and the *history of the times*, a *knowledge of human nature* will be very serviceable. For he who understands the human character, the propensities and powers, the passions and weaknesses of man, will readily discover the causes of many things attempted or done in former times. Nor will it serve his purpose less to know the *manners and opinions* in which the objects of his attention were brought up. For that is generally esteemed glorious and good which accords with views and habits derived from a former generation.

§ 14. In the history, which we call *external*, we must consider the *civil condition of those states*, in which the Christian religion was either approved or rejected: as also their *religious condition*, that is, the opinions of the people concerning the Deity and divine worship. For it will not be difficult to determine, why the church was now prosperous, and now in trouble, if we know what was the form of government, what the character of the rulers, and what the prevailing religion at the time.

§ 15. To dispel obscurities in the *internal* history, nothing is more conducive than a knowledge of the *history of learning*, and especially of *philosophy*. For, most unfortunately, human learning, or philosophy, has, in every age, been allowed more influence, in regard to revealed religion, than was proper, considering the natures of the two things. This end will also be materially served by an accurate inspection of political circumstances and ancient superstition. For the prudence (or shall I call it imprudence?) of prelates shaped many parts both of Christian discipline and worship after the pattern of the old religions; and no little deference has been paid to the pleasure of sovereigns, and to human laws, in regulating the church of God.¹

§ 16. Whence all this knowledge must be drawn is obvious of itself. The writers, clearly, of every age, who mention Christian affairs, especially those who were contemporary with the facts, are to be consulted; since all history depends on testimonies and authorities. Nor are those, however, to be neglected, who, from these, have composed histories and annals. For unwillingness to use another's help, when

¹ [Several of the externals in Romish worship have, undoubtedly, been borrowed from Paganism; most probably, with a view to conciliate prejudice. All Protestants consider this compromise a gross and culpable indiscretion. But they are not equally agreed as to certain questions of discipline, which Dr. Mosheim seems to have considered as also indiscreetly borrowed from ancient

religions. Many of them join the Latin and Oriental churches in denying any such origin to their discipline (except in as far as it may be connected with the divinely-constituted church of ancient Israel), and in considering their adoption of it a sacred duty forced upon them by the whole stream of ecclesiastical tradition, backed by no obscure confirmation from Scripture itself. S.]

close at hand, and contempt of their labours, who before us have striven to shed light on things obscure, is nearly akin to folly.¹

§ 17. From all this, it will be easy to determine the essential qualifications of a good ecclesiastical historian. He must have no moderate acquaintance with human affairs, various learning, a mind sagacious and practised in ratiocinations, a faithful memory, a judgment strengthened by use and exercise. In his will, there must be patience of labour and industry, a constant endeavour after truth and rectitude, freedom, in fine, from servitude of every kind.

§ 18. Now those who handle this branch of learning are very liable to servitude from three sources, namely, *times*, *persons*, and *opinions*. First, the *times* in which we live often have such ascendancy over us, that we measure past ages by them, thinking that formerly either to have been done, or to have been impossible, which now either is done, or is impossible. Then *persons*, whose testimony one must use, especially those of them who have long been famed for holiness and virtue, often lead us into error by their authority. Lastly, the love of *opinions* and doctrines, which have our own affections, often so constrains our minds, that even unconsciously we may give erroneous views of facts. This triple servitude must, therefore, to our utmost power, be driven from the mind.

§ 19. From this standard, and from other precepts equally indisputable and necessary, how widely those have strayed, in every age, who have employed themselves in these pursuits, is not unknown. I may set aside the many who think themselves great historians because they have the luck of good memories, and say nothing of others who are influenced not by the love of truth, but by that of their own interests, and very few remain whose veracity is absolutely proof against either the sect to which they are devoted, or the venerable name of ancient writers, or the influence of their times. In our age especially,

¹ To acquaint us with *all the writers* on ecclesiastical history, was the professed object of S. W. Slüterus in his *Propylæum historiæ Christianæ*, Luneb. 1696, 4to, and of Casp. Sagittarius, *Introductio ad historiam eccles. singulasque ejus partes*; especially vol. i. [2 vols. 4to. Jena, 1694, 1718. A good account of the most important writers is given by G. J. Planck, *Introduction to theological science* (in German), vol. ii. By J. A. Nösselt and C. F. L. Simon, *Guide to a knowledge of the best works in every branch of theology* (in German), 2 vols. 8vo, 2nd ed. Leipz. 1800-13. Valuable notices of the principal writers are to be found in J. G. Walch, *Bibliotheca theol. selecta*, t. iii., and in his *Historia eccles. Novi Test.* Also in the (German) *Church History* of J. M. Schröckh, vol. i. Introd. pt. iii. Tr.]

[A very useful view of the principal writers on ecclesiastical history is given by J. G. Dowling, M.A., in his *Introduction to the critical study of ecclesiastical history*.

(Lond. 1838.) The earliest known ecclesiastical historian was Hegesippus, who wrote *Ἰστορικὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πράξεων*, or *Commentaries of ecclesiastical affairs*, about the year 170, according to Cave. (*Hist. Lit.* Lond. 1688, p. 45.) Of this work, however, which was in five books, fragments only remain. The earliest extant ecclesiastical historian is Eusebius of Cæsarea, who wrote in the former half of the fourth century. But the father of ecclesiastical history, as now existing, was really Matthias Francowitz, or, as he called himself, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus*. The vast compilation, intemperately penned by himself and his coadjutors, in favour of Protestantism, and known as the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*, gave rise to a work, similarly extensive, by Cæsar Baronius, in favour of Romanism. Upon one, or both, of these two great party histories, have since been reared most works of a similar kind. S.]

with many, the force of the times and of opinions is incredible. Hence those arguments which so often occur in the books of learned men: *One is bound to think so: therefore it must be considered that the ancient Christians thought no otherwise. One must live thus according to Christ's injunction: therefore we cannot doubt that the earlier Christians lived thus. This is not now done: therefore neither did it formerly happen.*

§ 20. From these, and other faults, which we pass over, if those be free, who undertake the holier branch of history, it cannot fail of being very useful to the human race, especially to such as are intrusted with the care of sacred things. He who shall attentively consider the many, the so varied and bitter chances which the Christian religion has happily surmounted, will undoubtedly find himself strengthened in mind, and excellently fortified against the menaces, cavils, and stratagems of ungodly men. The so many illustrious examples, with which this history is filled, make wonderfully for the kindling of piety and the instilling of God's love into sluggish minds. Those astonishing changes of affairs, often sprung from small beginnings, exhibited by every age, conspicuously declare as well the governance of God's providence, as the inconstancy and vanity of human things. Nor is the profit light of knowing the origins of the many silly opinions, superstitions, and errors, by which the Christian world is yet oppressed in numerous lands. For this knowledge aids greatly in understanding the truth, loving, and resolutely keeping it. Of the pleasure to be drawn from these, and other things, I shall say nothing.

§ 21. Those particularly who are intrusted with the education of others, and the conducting of sacred affairs, may thence obtain great facilities for acquiring the wisdom which they cannot do without. Here, the numerous falls of men, otherwise great, show what is to be shunned, or the sacred city's peace will be disturbed: there, numbers of uncommon and praiseworthy deeds lay down a pattern which all ought to follow. For the combating of errors also, whether strong from age, or recent, nothing can be found, except Holy Scripture and sound reason, better than this history. Other advantages from this study I pass over, because they will soon strike anyone who enters upon it; nor do I mention its utility to those who are employed upon some different branch of learning, especially if this be jurisprudence.

§ 22. A twofold form of teaching is necessary in ecclesiastical history, the one *external*, the other *internal*. A long and continuous narration, extending over many ages, must, indeed, be distributed into certain intervals of time, as well for enabling learners to understand and remember it, as for the sake of order. The time, however, may be variously divided. We prefer to other ways its usual distribution into centuries, because it pleases most people, although it is not without its peculiar difficulties.

§ 23. But of these difficulties no very small part will be removed, if, besides these, we divide the whole time which has elapsed from

the rise of Christianity to ourselves, into certain greater intervals, which are defined by some remarkable changes in affairs. It seems best, accordingly, to comprise this entire history in four books. The *first* will unfold the church's fates from her very beginnings to Constantine the Great. The *second* will exhibit what has happened to the Christian commonwealth from Constantine's age to the times of Charles the Great. The *third* will run down from Charles the Great to that age in which oppressed truth was recalled to light in Germany, by the services of Luther. The *fourth* and last will extend from Luther to our own times.

§ 24. Moreover, ecclesiastical history treats, as we have already seen, of various distinct, but kindred *subjects*; which may properly be arranged under separate heads. Historians have adopted different classifications, such as their fancies or their designs in writing pointed out. The distribution, which we prefer, has been already indicated, and need not here be repeated.

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
UNDER THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK I.

CONTAINING
THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
FROM THE
BIRTH OF CHRIST TO CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

FIRST CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS STATE OF THE WORLD AT THE BIRTH OF OUR SAVIOUR.

§ 1. State of the Roman empire — § 2. Its evils — § 3. Its advantages — § 4. Then in peace — § 5. Other nations — § 6. All were idolaters — § 7. They worshipped different gods — § 8. They were tolerant — § 9. Most of their gods were deceased heroes — § 10. Pagan worship — § 11. It was confined to times and places — § 12. The mysteries — § 13. Paganism not the parent of virtue — § 14. Its votaries sunk in vice — § 15. How supported by the priests — § 16. The Roman and Grecian religions — § 17. The mixed religions of the provinces — § 18. Religions beyond the Roman empire classed — § 19. Philosophers unable to reform the world — § 20. The Oriental and Grecian philosophy — § 21. Some philosophers subverted all religion — § 22. Others debased it; e.g. Aristotelians — § 23. Stoics — § 24. Platonics — § 25. The Eclectics — § 26. Use of this chapter.

§ 1. GREAT part of the world, when God became incarnate, obeyed the Roman people. They ruled remoter nations, either by governors and presidents sent from Rome, but not for life, or let them use their own kings and institutions, though in such a way as kept up respect for the majesty and supreme power of the Roman state. The Roman senate and people themselves, though all appearance of liberty was not lost, really served a single man, *Augustus*, decorated with the offices of emperor, *pontifex maximus*, censor, tribune of the people, pro-consul; in a word, with everything that had any degree of national dignity and importance.¹

§ 2. The Roman government, if we regard only its form and laws, was sufficiently mild and equitable.² But from the injustice of

¹ See Aug. Campianus *de Officio et potestate magistratuum Romanorum. et jurisdictione*, l. i. c. 1, § 2, p. 3, &c. Geneva, 1725, 4to. [Blackwell's *Memoirs of the court of Augustus*, 4to. Edinb. 1753. Schl.]

² See Sir W. Moyle's *Essay on the con-*

stitution of the Roman government, in his *Posth. works*, i. 1—48. Lond. 1726, 8vo. Scip. Maffei, *Verona illustrata*, l. ii. p. 65. [Pet. Giannone, *Histoire civile du royaume de Naples*, i. 3, &c. Schl.]

presidents and nobles, their eagerness to enrich themselves; the popular anxiety not only to preserve acquisitions, but also to make fresh ones; the avarice besides of publicans, by whom the state revenues were usually farmed,¹ infinite grievances pressed upon the subjects. Those vices of magistrates and publicans despoiled the people of money and effects; while this anxiety not only occasioned many other evils, but also required numerous armies in the provinces, undoubtedly to the great oppression of their inhabitants, and stirred up almost perpetual wars.

§ 3. Still, this widely extended dominion of one people, or rather of one man, was attended with several advantages. *First*, it brought into union a multitude of nations, differing in customs and languages. *Secondly*, it gave freer access to the remoter nations.² *Thirdly*, it gradually civilised the barbarous nations, by introducing among them the Roman laws and customs. *Fourthly*, it spread literature, the arts, and philosophy, in countries where they were not before cultivated. All these greatly aided the ambassadors of our Lord, in fulfilling their sacred commission.³

§ 4. When Jesus Christ was born, the Roman world was much freer from commotions than it had been for many years. For, though I cannot agree with such as think, after Orosius, the temple of Janus to have been then shut, and all the globe at peace;⁴ yet it admits of no doubt, that our Saviour came down to men, in an age, which cannot be compared with its predecessor, without being called eminently peaceful. According to St. Paul himself, this peace was absolutely necessary to those whom Christ intrusted with his message to mankind.⁵

§ 5. Respecting other nations, not under the Roman power, from want of monuments one cannot say much that is clear and ascertained. Nor is it very necessary to our purpose: it is enough to understand one thing. The Eastern nations were oppressed by a severer domination of kings or tyrants; to the patient endurance of which, softness of body and mind, and even the religion which they professed, much conduced. Such as were, on the other hand, in the northern regions, or not far from them, had far more liberty, which was protected no less by rigour of climate, and a habit of body sprung from it, than by their mode of life and religion.⁶

§ 6. All these nations were plunged in the grossest superstition. For though the idea of one supreme God was not wholly extinct,⁷

¹ [See P. Burmann, *de Vectigalibus populi Romani*, c. ix. p. 123, &c. *Schl.*]

² See Nic. Bergier, *Histoire des grands chemins de l'empire Romain*, 2nd ed. Brussels, 1728, 4to, and Everard Otto, *de Tutela viarum publicarum*, pt. ii. p. 314.

³ Origen, among others, acknowledges this: lib. ii. *adv. Celsum*, p. 79, ed. Cantabr. [See also Heilmann, *Comment. de florente literarum statu et habitu ad relig. Christi initia*, *Schl.*]

⁴ See Joh. Massoni, *Templum Jani*,

Christo nascente, reseratum. Roterod. 1706, 8vo.

⁵ See 1 Tim. ii. 1, &c.

⁶ Seneca, *de Ira*, ii. 16. Opp. i. 36, ed. Gronovii: Fere itaque imperia penes eos fuere populos, qui mitiore cælo utuntur: in frigora, septentrionemque vergentibus immansueta ingenia sunt, ut ait poëta, *suoque simillima cælo*.

⁷ [See Christopher Meiners' *Historia doctrinæ de vero Deo, omnium rerum auctore atque rectore*. 2 parts, Lemgo. 1780, pp.

yet most nations, or rather all except the Jews, supposed that each country and province was subjected to a set of very powerful beings, whom they called gods, and whom the people, in order to live happily, must propitiate with various rites and ceremonies.¹ These deities were supposed to differ materially from each other, in sex, power, nature, and offices. Some nations, indeed, went beyond others in impiety and absurdity of worship, but all were justly chargeable with neglect of reason, and extreme folly in matters of religion.

§ 7. Thus every nation had a class of deities peculiar to itself, over which one more powerful and venerable than the rest presided, yet even he must obey the laws of fate, or eternal necessity. The orientals had not, however, the same gods as the Gauls, Germans, and other inhabitants of the northern regions. The Grecian deities differed altogether from those of the Egyptians, who had no hesitation in adding to the gods, animals, plants, and I know not what works of nature and art besides.² Each nation likewise had its own method of worshipping and propitiating the gods, differing widely from religious practices elsewhere. But, from ignorance and other causes, the Greeks and Romans maintained, that *their* gods were universally worshipped: and therefore called foreign deities by the names of their own. It can scarcely be said how much darkness and confusion this opinion has brought into the history of ancient religions, and

548, 12mo, where, from a critical investigation, proof is adduced, that the ancient pagan nations were universally ignorant of the Creator and Governor of the world; till Anaxagoras, about 450 B.C., and afterwards other philosophers, conceived that the world must have had an intelligent architect. *Tr.*]

¹ [‘We conclude universally, that all that multiplicity of pagan gods, which makes so great a show and noise, was really either nothing but several names and notions of one supreme Deity, according to its different manifestations, gifts, and effects in the world, personated, or else many inferior understanding beings, generated or created by one Supreme: so that one unmade, self-existent Deity, and no more, was acknowledged by the more intelligent of the ancient pagans, (for of the sottish vulgar no man can pretend to give an account in any religion), and consequently, the pagan polytheism or idolatry consisted, not in worshipping a multiplicity of unmade minds, deities, and creators, self-existent from eternity, and independent upon one Supreme; but in mingling and blending, some way or other, unduly, *creature-worship* with the *worship of the Creator*.’ (Cudworth’s *Intellectual System*, Lond. 1678, p. 230.) Hence Faustus, the Manichean, branded both Jews and Christians as nothing better than schismatics from gentilism, maintaining that their doctrine

of the divine unity was really derived from the heathens. Julian, the apostate, also maintained one common Creator, with inferior gods under him, each having to administer a province of his own. (*Ibid.* 231, 274.) In India, Bp. Heber was admitted into a small square court in the fort of Chunar, containing a large slab of black marble, holden in the highest veneration as the actual seat of the Deity during nine hours in every day. On the opposite wall was ‘a rudely-carved rose enclosed in a triangle,’ but no image was to be seen. (*Journey through the Upper Provinces of India*, Lond. 1828, i. 408.) Thus, in strict accuracy, polytheism cannot be charged either upon ancient or modern pagans: at all events, not upon their system, or its more enlightened adherents. The system, in fact, is an undue blending of *creature-worship* with the *worship of the Creator*. This is analogous to the Romish usage of praying to saints. S.]

² Athanasius, *Oratio contra gentes*. Opp. i. 25. [See Le Clerc, *Ars critica*, pt. ii. sect. i. c. 13, § 11, and *Bibliothèque Choisie*, vii. 84. Warburton’s *Divine legation of Moses demonstrated*, ii. 233, &c. And respecting the Egyptian gods, see P. E. Jablonsky, *Pantheon Ægyptiorum*, Francf. ad Viadr. 1750, 8vo. F. S. von Schmidt, *Opuscula, quibus res antiquæ, præcipue Ægyptiacæ, explanantur*. 1765, 8vo. *Schl.*]

how many errors it has produced in the books of very learned men.¹

§ 8. But this variety of gods and religions in the pagan nations, produced no wars or feuds among them; unless, perhaps, the Egyptians are an exception.² Yet even among them, the wars for their gods cannot properly be considered as sacred and religious. Each nation, without concern, allowed its neighbours to enjoy their own views of religion, and to worship their own gods in their own way. Nor need this tolerance greatly surprise us. For they who regard the world as a great country divided into different provinces, each subject to a distinct order of deities, cannot despise the gods of other nations, and compel strangers to worship their own divinities. The Romans, in particular, though they would not allow the public religions to be changed or multiplied, yet gave their citizens entire liberty to follow privately the worship of other countries, and to honour with assemblies, feasts, temples, groves, and other things, those foreign deities whose rites had nothing inconsistent with domestic safety and institutions.³

§ 9. The greater part of the gods of all nations were ancient heroes, famous for their achievements and worthy deeds, as kings, generals, and founders of cities; or even females, who had gained renown by something accomplished or invented. Hence the gratitude of posterity raised them to the skies. To these, some added the more splendid and useful objects in the natural world: among which, the sun, moon, and stars, being preeminent, received worship from nearly all; and some were not ashamed to pay divine honours to mountains, rivers, trees, the earth, the ocean, the winds, and even to diseases, to virtues and vices, and to almost every conceivable object — or, at least, to the deities supposed to preside over these objects.⁴

§ 10. The worship of these deities consisted in numerous ceremonies, with sacrifices, offerings, and prayers. The ceremonies were for the most part absurd and ridiculous; and throughout debasing, obscene, and cruel. The sacrifices and offerings varied according to the nature and offices of the different gods.⁵ Most nations immolated

¹ [The former editions contain notes by Dr. Murdock and Mr. Soames on *Comparative Mythology*, a subject which, when Mosheim wrote, had not been critically examined, and for the discussion of which little more was done by Bryant and Faber than to collect facts from which historical, ethnological, and philological scholars are now working out more probable theories. For a very learned and interesting examination of the part of the question that concerns language, see an essay by Prof. M. Müller in *Oxford Essays*, London, 1856; and his *Lectures on Language*, London, 1861, p. 11. *Ed.*]

² See what Laur. Pignori has collected on this subject, in his *Expositio mensæ Isiaccæ*, p. 41, &c.

³ See Corn. à Bynckershoeck, *Dissert.*

de cultu peregrinæ religionis apud Romanos, in his *Opuscula*, L. Bat. 1719, 4to. [Warburton's *Div. Leg.* i. 307. Cf. Livy, *Hist. Rom.* lib. xxv. 1, and xxxix. 18, and Valer. Max. i. 3. *Schl.*—See also N. Lardner, *Credib. of Gospel History*, pt. i. bk. i. c. 8, § 3—6. *Tr.*]

⁴ See the learned work of G. J. Vossius, *de Idololatria*, lib. i.—iii. [and *La Mythologie et les fables expliquées par l'Histoire*, par l'Abbé Banier, Paris, 1738—40, 8 vols. 12mo, and Fr. Creutzer's *Symbolik u. Mythologie der alten Völker, besonders der Griechen*. Leipz. u. Darmst. 1810—12, 4 vols. 8vo. *Tr.*]

⁵ J. Saubertus, *de Sacrificiis Veterum*; republished by T. Crenius, L. Bat. 1699, 8vo.

animals, and some likewise human beings,¹ a most hideous practice. Their prayers might be truly called insipid, and void of true piety, whether one considers their form or matter;² over this whole worship presided pontiffs, priests, and servants of the gods, divided into many classes; whose business it was, to see that nothing should be done improperly. These people were supposed to enjoy the friendship and familiar converse of the gods; and they basely abused their authority to impose on the people.

§ 11. The religious worship of most nations was not only confined to certain *places* and temples,³ but also to certain *times* and stated days. In the temples were placed statues and figures of their gods; and these representations were thought animated in an inexplicable manner by the deities themselves. For, senseless as these worshippers of fictitious gods really were, they nevertheless did not choose to have the credit of adoring lifeless images, brass, stone, and wood, but the deity which the statue represented, whom they considered present in it, if its dedication had been properly performed.⁴

§ 12. Besides this common worship, to which all had free access, there were, among both orientals and Greeks, certain recondite and concealed rites, called *mysteries*; to which very few were admitted. Candidates for initiation had first to give satisfactory proof to the Hierophants of their good faith and patience, by various most troublesome ceremonies. When initiated, they could not divulge anything they had seen, without exposing their lives to imminent danger.⁵ Hence it is, that the interior of these rites is, at this day, little known. Yet we know, that in some of the mysteries, many things were done repugnant to modesty and propriety. Nor, from the whole of them, could understanding minds be at any loss to see that the gods who were worshipped, had been men more distinguished for their vices than their virtues.⁶

¹ H. Columna, *ad Fragmenta Ennii*, p. 29; and J. Saubertus, *de Sacrificiis Vet.* cap. 21, p. 455.

² Matt. Browerius à Niedeck, *de Adorationibus veterum Populorum*, Traj. 1711, 8vo. [and Saubertus, p. 343, &c. *Schl.*]

³ [‘Some nations were without temples, such as the Persians, Gauls, Germans, and Britons, who performed their religious worship in the open air, or in the shady retreats of consecrated groves.’ *Maccl.*]

⁴ Arnobius, *adv. Gentes*, lib. vi. p. 254, ed. Heraldi. Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, vii. 33. Opp. vii. 161, ed. Benedict. Julian, *Misopogon*, p. 361, ed. Spanheim.

⁵ Jo. Meursius, *de Mysteriis Eleusiniis*; and David Clarkson, *Discourse on Liturgies*, § iv.

⁶ [Cicero, *Disput. Tusculan.* i. 13, [and *de Leg.* 24. Varro, cited by Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, iv. 31. Eusebius, *Preparat. Evangel.* ii. 3. *Schl.*]—See also Warburton’s *Divine legat.* i. lib. ii. § 4, who was confronted by J. Leland, *Advantages and*

necessity of the Christian Rev. vol. i. ch. 8, 9, p. 151—190.—C. Meiners, *über die Mysterien der Alten*; in his *Miscel. philos. works*, vol. iii. Leipz. 1776. The Baron de Ste. Croix, *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire de la religion secrète des anciens peuples*, &c. Paris, 1784, 8vo, and (P. J. Vogel’s) *Briefe über die Mysterien*; which are the 2nd collection of *Letters on Freemasonry*, Nuremb. 1784, 12mo. It has been maintained that the design of at least some of these mysteries, was, to inculcate the grand principles of natural religion; such as the unity of God, the immortality of the soul, the importance of virtue, &c., and to explain the vulgar polytheism as symbolical of these great truths. But this certainly needs better proof. It is more probable that the later pagan philosophers, who lived after the light of Christianity had exposed the abominations of polytheism, resorted to this subterfuge in order to vindicate the character of their predecessors. *Tr.*]

§ 13. The whole pagan system had not the least efficacy to produce and cherish true virtue in the soul. For, in the *first* place, the gods and goddesses, to whom religious homage was publicly paid, were patterns rather of glaring vices and iniquities than of virtues.¹ They were considered indeed as superior to mortals in power, and as exempt from death; but in all things else as on a level with us. In the *next* place, the ministers of this religion, neither by precept nor example, exhorted the people to lead good and becoming lives; but gave them to understand, that all worship of the gods was comprised in rites and institutions received from former generations.² And *lastly*, current doctrines respecting the rewards of good men, and the punishments of bad ones after this life, were some of them dubious and uncertain, and others more adapted for promoting vice than virtue.³ Hence most of the wiser people, about the time when Christ was born, contemned and ridiculed all these things.

§ 14. Hence a universal corruption of morals prevailed, and crimes, which at this day cannot be named with decency, were then practised with entire impunity.⁴ Those who would see proof of this, may read Juvenal and Persius among the Latins, and Lucian among the Greeks: or if this appear too much trouble, it will be enough to think merely of the gladiatorial shows, the flagitious loves of boys, and abominable lusts; the licence of divorce, both among Greeks and Romans; the practice of exposing infants, and procuring abortion; the stews consecrated to gods: all which no law forbade.⁵

¹ Ovid, *de Tristibus*, lib. ii. v. 287, &c.:

Quis locus est templis augustior? hæc quoque vitet,

In culpam si qua est ingeniosa suam.

Cum steterit Jovis æde, Jovis succurret in æde,

Quam multas matres fecerit ille Deus.

Proxima adoranti Junonia templa subit,

Pellicibus multis hanc doluisse Deam.

Pallade conspectâ, natum de crimine virgo

Sustulerit quare quæret Erichthonium.

[Compare Plato, *de Leg.* lib. i. p. 776, and *de Republ.* lib. ii. p. 430, &c. ed. Ficini. Isocrates, *Encom. Busiridis*, Oratt. p. 462, and Seneca, *de Vita beata*, cap. 26. *Schl.*]

² See J. Barbeyrac, Preface to his French translation of Puffendorf's *Law of nature and nations*, § vi. [Yet some intelligent pagans had better views, as Socrates and the younger Pliny. The latter, in his *Panegyric on Trajan*, cap. iii. n. 6, says: Animadverto, — etiam Deos ipsos, non tam accuratis adorantium precibus, quam innocentia et sanctitate lætari: gratioremque existimari, qui delubris eorum puram castamque mentem, quam qui meditatum carmen intulerit. *Schl.*]

³ [What the Greeks and Romans said of the Elysian Fields, was not only fabulous in its very aspect, but it held out the prospect of voluptuous pleasures, opposed to

true virtue. The more northern nations promised a happy immortality only to those who distinguished themselves by a martial spirit and the slaughter of numerous foes; that is, to the enemies of mankind. And the eternal bliss, which they promised to these warriors, was only a continued indulgence in vile lusts. How could such hopes excite to virtue? — Moreover, the doctrine of even these rewards and punishments was not an article of faith, among the Greeks and Romans; but everyone believed what he pleased concerning it: and, at the time of Christ's birth, the followers of Epicurus were numerous, and while many denied, most others doubted, the reality of future retribution. Polybius, *Hist.* v. 54. Sallust, *Bell. Catil.* — *Schl.*]

⁴ Cyprian, *Epist.* i. p. 2, ed. Baluz. describes at large the debased morals of the pagans. See also Cornelii Adami *Exercit. de malis Romanorum ante prædicationem Evangelii moribus*; in his *Exercit. Exeget. Exercit.* v. Gröning. 1712, 4to. [and St. Paul *to the Romans*, chap. i. passim. *Tr.*]

⁵ [On the subject of this and several preceding sections, the reader may find satisfactory proof, in *The advantage and necessity of the Christian Revelation, shown from the state of religion in the ancient heathen world*; by J. Leland, D.D. 2nd ed. Dublin, 1765. 2 vols. 8vo. *Tr.*]

§ 15. Men, who were not altogether dull and slow, saw through the deformity of these religions, but the crafty priests had two methods of opposing them. First, they talked of miracles and prodigies which had occurred in the temples and before the statues of the gods and heroes, and which were daily witnessed still; then they laid claim to divination and oracles, by which the gods foreshowed future events. In both cases, priestly cunning shamefully imposed upon the people; nor did this escape discerning minds.¹ But it was needful to laugh with caution, if one would be safe. For the priests were in the habit of charging with treason to the gods, before a raging and superstitious populace, those who laid bare their frauds.

§ 16. At the time chosen by the Son of God for his birth among men, the Roman religion, as well as arms, pervaded a large part of the world. Of this religion he has a sufficient knowledge, who is not unacquainted with the superstitions of the Greeks.² There are, however, some differences between them. For the Romans, to say nothing of institutions invented by Numa and others for political ends, had augmented Grecian fables by some Italic and Etrurian figments, besides giving to the gods of Egypt some sort of place among their own.³

§ 17. In the Roman provinces a new kind of religion gradually sprang up, compounded of that anciently professed by the people and that of their conquerors. For these nations, who before their subjugation had their peculiar gods and religious rites, were persuaded by degrees to adopt many of the Roman usages. This was good policy in the Romans, whose interests were promoted by the extinction of those inhuman rites which prevailed in many quarters; and it was an object no less aided by popular levity there, than by the desire that prevailed to please their masters.⁴

§ 18. The most prominent religions beyond the bounds of the Roman empire may be divided into two classes, the *civil* and the *military*. To the first class belong the religions of most of the oriental nations, especially of the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Indians. For, whoever carefully inspects these will easily see their adaptation to political objects, as the protection of royal authority and majesty, the preservation of public tranquillity, the increase of civil virtues, and to no others. To the second class must be referred the religions of the northern nations. For all that was inculcated, among the Germans, Britons, Celts, Goths, and others, respecting the gods and

¹ [According to Schlegel, Mosheim, till towards the close of his life, did not utterly reject that common opinion of the ancients, that *evil spirits* sometimes aided the pagan priests, particularly in regard to their oracles. But he did, we are told by his pupil, come at last into the opinion now generally admitted, namely, that the pagan oracles were all mere cheats, proceeding from the crafts of the priests. See Van Dale, *de Oraculis ethnicorum*: among his Diss. Amstel. 1696,

4to, and Bern. Fontenelle, *Histoire des oracles*, 1687, with the Jesuit, J. F. Baltus, *Réponse à l'histoire des oracles*, &c. Strasb. 1707, 8vo, and *Suite de la Réponse*, &c. 1708, 8vo. Tr.]

² Dionys. Halicar. *Antiquitatt. Romanor.* vii. 72, t. i. p. 460, ed. Hudson.

³ See Sam. Petitus, *ad Leges Atticas*, l. i. tit. i. p. 71. [Lactantius, *Divinarum Institution.* i. 20. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Strabo, *Geograph.* l. iv. p. 189, &c. *Schl.*]

the worship due to them, was evidently suited to awaken and cherish fortitude, ferocity, and contempt of life. A careful examination of these religions will fully verify these statements.

§ 19. No nation was so rude and barbarous as to be completely without persons who saw the folly of these religions. But some of them were destitute of authority and means to remedy these evils, others had not will; all were left without sufficient wisdom for such an arduous undertaking. This can scarcely be better seen than from those attempts which Greek and Roman philosophers made against vulgar superstitions. Although they prescribed many things, not incorrectly, concerning God's nature and human duties, besides discussing sensibly enough the popular religion, yet they added to these things such wildness and absurdity, as clearly showed that it is God alone, and not men, who can teach truth without colouring and mistaking it.

§ 20. When the Son of God appeared among men, the general form of philosophizing that reigned among nations, not altogether uncivilised, was twofold: namely, the *Grecian*, which was also adopted by the Romans; and the *oriental*, which had many followers in Persia, Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and even among the Jews. The former was properly called *philosophy*: the latter, those who spoke Greek designated as *γνώσις*, that is, *knowledge*, namely Θεοῦ, of God; because its followers pretended to restore the lost knowledge of the supreme Deity.¹ The friends of both were split into various sects vehemently disagreeing upon many subjects; yet with this difference, that all the sects of oriental philosophy set out from one principle, which kept them steady to some common positions, while the Greeks disagreed as to the very foundations of all wisdom. — Of the oriental philosophy, we shall give account hereafter: of the Grecian and its factions, notice will be taken here.

§ 21. Some of the Grecian sects declared open war against all religion: others, though opposed neither to a deity nor his worship, rather obscured than threw light upon the truth. Of the former class were the *Epicureans*, and the *Academics*. The Epicureans maintained that the world arose from chance; that the gods (whose existence they did not dare to deny) neither did, nor could, care for human affairs; that our souls were born and died; that *pleasure*²

¹ St. Paul mentions and disapproves both kinds of philosophy; namely, the Grecian, *Colos.* ii. 8, and the oriental, or *γνώσις*, 1 *Tim.* vi. 20. [Mosheim has been censured for his confident assertion of the existence of an oriental philosophy, under the name of *γνώσις*, so early as the days of Christ and his apostles. See note to cent. i. p. ii. c. i. § 5. *Tr.*]

² [The ambiguity of the word *pleasure* has produced many disputes in the explication of the Epicurean system. If by *pleasure* be understood only *sensual* gratifications, the tenet here advanced is indisputably

monstrous. But if it be extended to intellectual and moral objects, in what does the scheme of Epicurus, with respect to virtue, differ from the opinions of those Christian philosophers, who maintain that *self-love* is the only spring of all human affections and actions? *Macl.* — Epicurus distinguished between *corporeal* pleasure and *mental*. But he accounted both *sensitive*; because he held the soul to be *material*. His conceptions of pleasure did not extend beyond *natural pleasures*; the chief of which he supposed to be a calm and tranquil state of *mind*, undisturbed by any fear of God, or

was the governing principle, and the only reason why virtue should be loved. The Academics denied the possibility of arriving at certainty; and, therefore, disputed whether the gods existed or not; whether the soul is mortal, or survives the body; whether virtue is preferable to vice, or the contrary.¹ These two sects, when Jesus was born, were very numerous and influential; being favoured by men of rank especially, and by nearly all the opulent.²

§ 22. To the second class belong the *Aristotelians*, *Stoics*, and *Platonics*; none of whom, however, so treated of God, religion, and moral duties, as to be of much service to mankind. The god of *Aristotle* is like the principle of motion in a machine: a nature happy in contemplation, and ignorant of human things. A god of this kind, who differs little from those of *Epicurus*, there is no reason for either loving or fearing. Whether this philosopher held the soul to

any solicitude about the future; and attended with freedom from bodily pain. His system, therefore, denied the very idea of *moral* or *religious* pleasures; and it required *atheism* as its foundation. See *Stäudlin's Geschich. d. Moralphilos.* p. 230, &c. Hanov. 1822, 8vo. Tr.]

¹ [The Academics, or Platonists, became indeed sceptical; especially those of the Middle Academy. Some real Pyrrhonists, likewise, assumed the name of Academics. Still, it is probable, the great body of Academics, like Cicero, who is accounted one of them, merely held that all human knowledge is *imperfect*, that is, falls short of certainty; that of course we are obliged, in all cases, to act upon *probabilities*; of which there are different degrees. Tr.]

² The Epicureans were the more numerous of the two. See Cicero, *de Finibus bonor. et malor.* i. 7, ii. 14, and *Disput. Tuscul.* v. 10. Hence Juvenal, *Sat.* xiii. v. 86, &c. thus complains of the many atheists at Rome:

Sunt in fortunæ qui casibus omnia ponant,
Et nullo credant mundum rectore moveri,
Naturâ volvente vices et lucis et anni:
Atque ideo intrepidi quæcunque altaria
tangunt.

[Mosheim, in these sections, gives the dark side of pagan philosophy. Like his other translators, therefore, I would aim so to soften his pictures, that the less informed reader may not be misled. This, I am persuaded, Mosheim would himself approve; as may be inferred from the following long note, inserted apparently for such a purpose, in the parallel passage of his *Commentarii de Rebb. Christ. ante Constant.* p. 17, 18:—‘I cannot agree with those who maintain, that every one of the philosophers of those times, even such as discoursed well on religious subjects, were hostile to all religion. I think those learned moderns have gone too

far, who have endeavoured to prove that every sect of the philosophers, either openly or covertly, aimed to rip up the foundation of all religion. Are we to believe that not one of the many great and worthy men of those times, however free from ill intentions, was so fortunate as to make a proper use of his reason? Must all those who professed theism, and spoke sublimely of the divine perfections, be regarded as impostors, who said one thing, and meant another? Yet the celebrated and acute W. Warburton, to mention no others, lately expended much ingenuity and learning to bring us to such conclusions. See his very elaborate and noted work, entitled *The Divine Legation*, &c. i. 332, &c. and 419, &c. He would have us think, that all the philosophers who taught the immortality of the soul, secretly denied it; that they held *nature* to be the only deity; and human souls to be particles, severed from the soul of the world, to which they return at the death of the body. But not to mention that he cites only Grecian philosophers, while other nations had their philosophers also, differing widely from the Grecian; the renowned author depends not on plain and explicit testimony, which seems requisite to justify so heavy a charge, but merely on conjectures on single examples, and on inferences from the doctrines held by certain philosophers. If this kind of proof be allowed, if single instances and inferences are sufficient to convict men of duplicity, when no shadow of suspicion appears in their language, who will be found innocent? Though but an ordinary man, and far inferior to Warburton, yet I could prove that all the theologians in Christendom disbelieve, utterly, what they teach in public; and that they covertly aim to instil the poison of impiety into men's minds; if I might be allowed to assail them in the manner this learned writer assails the philosophers.’ Tr.]

be mortal or immortal is at least doubtful.¹ Now what solid and sound precepts of virtue and piety can that man give who denies the providence of God, and not obscurely intimates that the soul is mortal?

§ 23. The god of the *Stoics* has a little more of majesty; nor does he sit idle above the heaven and stars. Yet he is described as a *corporeal* being, united to matter by a necessary connexion; and, moreover, subject to *fate*:—so that he can neither reward nor punish. That death was decreed to souls by this sect, no scholar is unaware. Now such doctrines take away the strongest motive to virtue. Wherefore, the moral system of the *Stoics*, though a body splendid and illustrious, has neither nerves nor limbs.²

§ 24. Plato passes for the wisest of all the philosophers, and not undeservedly. For he set over the universe a God great in liberty, power, and intelligence; he showed men likewise both what to hope, and what to fear, after the body's death. Yet, to say nothing of the very slender foundations on which his whole doctrine rests, and of its great obscurity besides, that supreme creator of the world, whom he praises, not only wants many virtues,³ but is also contained in a certain place and space. What he says upon the soul and demons has an extraordinary tendency to produce and encourage superstition.⁴ Nor will his system of morals command very high estimation, if we examine it in all its parts and enquire into its first principles.⁵

§ 25. As in all these sects were many things inconsistent with right reason, joined to a fondness for striving and debate, some well-disposed and moderate men determined upon believing no one of them implicitly, but upon selecting from all the better parts that were unquestionably reasonable, despising what remained. Hence originated in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria, a new mode of philosophizing, called the *eclectic*.⁶ One Potamon of Alexandria has been represented as its author; but the subject has its difficulties.⁷ That this sect

¹ See the notes on my Latin translation of R. Cudworth's *Intellectual System*: i. 66, 500, ii. 1171, and Mich. Morgues, *Plan théologique du Pythagorisme*, i. 75, &c.

² These remarks receive some illustration from my note on Cudworth's *Intel. Syst.* i. 517.

³ [He ascribed to God neither omnipotence, nor omnipresence, nor omniscience. *Schl.*]

⁴ [He believed that God employs good and evil demons in the government of the world; and that men can have commerce with these demons. A person believing this may easily be led to regard idolatry as not altogether irrational. *Schl.*]

⁵ The defects of the Platonic philosophy are copiously, but not very accurately, depicted by Fran. Baltus, in a French work, *Défense des pères accusés de Platonisme*, Paris, 1711, 4to. [Plato has, moreover, been accused of Spinozism.

For Bale (*Continuation des pensées diverses sur la Comète*, &c. cap. 25), and Gundling (in *Otiis*, fasc. 2, and in *Gundlingianis*, Th. 43, 45) tax him with confounding God with matter. But Zimmermann (*Opuscula*, tom. i. p. 762, &c.) and the elder Schellhorn (*Amenitatt. litterar.* tom. ix. xii. and xiii.) have defended the character of Plato. *Schl.*]

⁶ ['The Eclectic philosophy is so called from its professing to select the better parts of the systems invented before it, and to digest these into one consistent doctrine.' Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*, Lond. 1833, p. 111. S.]

⁷ [J. Brucker, *Historia crit. philos.* ii. 193, has shown, that in regard to the controversies maintained by Heumann, Hasæus, and others, respecting this nearly unknown Potamon, the probability is, that he lived about the close of the second century; that his speculations had little

flourished at Alexandria, in the age of our Saviour, is manifest from the Jewish Philo, who philosophized according to its principles.¹ These Eclectics held Plato in the highest estimation; but they unscrupulously modified his doctrines by incorporating what they pleased from the other philosophers.²

§ 26. It will be easy to see what inference should be drawn from this account of the world's lamentable state when Christ was born. All may learn from it that mankind, in that age thoroughly corrupt, stood in need of some divine teacher, who should not only imbue men's minds with indisputable precepts of religion and true wisdom, but also recall their erring steps into the way of virtue and piety. Nor will these observations profit less those who are not sufficiently aware how much protection and advantage Christ's advent brought to men, and how beneficially his religion acted upon all the circumstances of life. Many despise and speak ill of the Christian religion, because they do not know themselves indebted to it for all the blessings they enjoy.

effect; and that Ammonius is to be regarded as the founder of the Eclectic sect. Yet this will not forbid our believing, what Brucker himself admits, that there were *some* Grecian philosophers, as early as the times of Christ, who speculated very much as the Eclectics afterwards did; though the few followers they had did not merit the title of a *sect*. *Schl.*]

¹ [For he philosophized in the manner of Clemens Alex., Origen, and the other Christian doctors, who were certainly *Eclectics*. For the most part, he follows Plato, and hence many account him a pure Platonist. But he often commends the Stoics, Pythagoreans, and others, and adopts their opinions. *Schl.*]

² See Godfr. Olearius, *de Philosophia Eclectica*; James Brucker, and others. [On the philosophy, as well as the vulgar polytheism of the ancient pagans, the best work for the mere English reader seems to be that already mentioned, J. Leland's *Advantage and neces-*

sity of the Christian revelation, shown from the state of religion in the ancient heathen world, 2nd ed. 1765, 2 vols. 8vo.—The history of philosophy among the ancients has not been critically and ably written in English, nor by Englishmen. Stanley's *Lives*, &c. 1655, 4to, is full of mistakes; and Enfield's *Abridgement of Brucker* is quite superficial. The best general works are J. Brucker's *Historia critica philosophiæ*, Lips. 1741—67, 6 vols. 4to, and the more recent German works by Tiedeman (7 vols. 8vo, 1791—96), Buhle (7 vols. 8vo, 1800), Tenneman (12 vols. 8vo, 1798—1810), and Rixner (3 vols. 8vo, 1822). The history of moral philosophy, or ethics, is well treated by Cp. Meiners (*krit. Geschichte*, 2 vols. 8vo, 1800—1,) and C. F. Stäudlin, *Gesch. der Moralphilosophie*, 1822, p. 1055, 8vo. *Tr.*—See Lewes' *Biographical History of Philosophy*, Lond. 1857. *Ed.*]

CHAPTER II.

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS STATE OF THE JEWS AT THE BIRTH
OF CHRIST.

§ 1. Herod the Great then reigned—§ 2. State of the Jews after his death—§ 3. Their troubles and calamities—§ 4. which were increased by their leading men—§ 5. Their religion greatly corrupted, both among the common people—§ 6. and among their teachers, who were divided into three sects—§ 7. Their dissensions—§ 8. Their toleration of each other—§ 9. The Essenes—§ 10. The Therapeutæ—§ 11. Moral doctrines of these sects—§ 12. Low state of religion among the people—§ 13. The Cabbala, a source of error—§ 14. Their form of worship debased by pagan rites—§ 15. Causes of the corruption of the nation—§ 16. Yet religion not wholly extinct—§ 17. The Samaritans—§ 18. State of the Jews out of Palestine.

§ 1. THE condition of the Jews, among whom it pleased our Saviour to be born, was little better than that of other nations. Their state was harassed rather than governed by Herod, who was indebted to his vices for the surname of the Great, but who really was a tributary of the Roman people. This man, by cruelty, suspiciousness, wars, drew infinite hatred on himself, while he exhausted the wretched nation's wealth, by a mad luxury, a magnificence beyond his fortune, and immoderate largesses. Under his administration, Roman luxury, joined with great licentiousness, spread over Palestine.¹ In religion he was professedly a Jew; but he copied the manners of those who despise all religion.

§ 2. On this tyrant's death, the Romans gave half Palestine² to his son Archelaus for government, under the title of *Etarch*: the other half was divided between two other sons of Herod, Antipas and Philip. Archelaus copied his father's vices; wherefore, ten years after that prince's death, an accusation against him was brought by the Jews before Augustus, and he was deprived of his authority.³ The countries that he had governed were now reduced to the form of a province, and annexed to Syria. This political change brought infinite uneasiness and calamities on the Jews, to the ultimate ruin and subversion of their nation.

¹ See Christ. Noldii *Historia Idumæa*, in Havercamp's Josephus, ii. 333, &c. Ja. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, t. i. pt. i. p. 27, &c. H. Noris, *Cenotaph. Pisan.* ii. 6. H. Prideaux, *Connexions*, &c. pt. ii. lib. viii. Chr. Cellarius, *Historia Herodum*, in his *Diss. Acad.* pt. i. and especially, the Jewish historian, Fl. Josephus, in his

Wars of the Jews.

² [Viz. Judea, Samaria, and Idumæa. Tr.]

³ [Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* xvii. 13, and *de Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. *Schl.*—Archelaus was additionally punished by the confiscation of all his property, and by banishment to Vienne, in Gaul. S.]

§ 3. The Romans did not, indeed, wholly prohibit the Jews from retaining their national laws, and the religion established by Moses. Their religious affairs were still conducted by a High Priest, with priests and Levites under him; and by their national senate or Sanhedrim. The exterior of their worship, with a few exceptions, remained unaltered. But it can be scarcely told, how many evils the wretched people underwent from the very presence of the Romans, whom they thought polluted and detestable; how many from the avarice and cruelty of the governors; how many from the frauds and injuries of the publicans. Unquestionably, those lived more comfortably who were subject to the other two sons of Herod.

§ 4. But the Romans left nothing of liberty or happiness for the Jews that was not intercepted by the crimes and vices of those among themselves, who set up for their defenders. The chiefs of their nation, the high priests, it is clear from Josephus, were most abandoned persons, whose dignity had been gained either by money, or by compliances that bespoke an irreligious mind, and who maintained their ill-acquired authority by every sort of crimes. The other priests, and all those who held any considerable office, were not much better. The common people, tempted by these examples, rushed headlong upon iniquities of all kinds, until perpetual robberies and seditions called for vengeance, both from God and men.¹

§ 5. Two religions then flourished in Palestine, the *Jewish*, and the *Samaritan*; between the followers of which a deadly hatred prevailed. The nature of the former is set forth in the Old Testament. But in our Saviour's age, it had lost much of its primitive form and character. The people, universally, were infected with certain prevalent and pernicious errors; the more learned fiercely contended on points of the greatest moment. All looked for a deliverer; not, however, such a one as God had promised, but a powerful warrior, and a vindicator of their national liberties.² None carried religion further than observance of the rites prescribed by Moses, and of certain external duties towards the Gentiles. All excluded the rest of mankind from the hope of salvation; and of course, whenever they dared, treated them with inhumanity and hatred.³ Besides drawing corruption from these most fruitful sources, they entertained various absurd and superstitious opinions concerning the divine nature, genii, magic, and other things, partly brought home by their ancestors from the Babylonian captivity, partly imported by themselves from the neighbouring Egyptians, Syrians, and Arabians.⁴

¹ [Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* v. 13, § 6; and Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, i. c. 16. *Schl.*]

² [This is proved by J. Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, v. c. 10. That not only the Pharisees, but all Jews, of whatever sect, both in and out of Palestine, were expecting a Messiah, is shown by Mosheim, *Commentt. de Rebb. Christ.* &c. p. 40, from the following texts, John i. 20, 25; x. 24, &c.; xii. 34; Matt. ii. 4—6; xxi. 9; xxvi. 63,

&c. *Schl.*]

³ [Hence other nations accounted the Jews as enemies of mankind. See J. Elsner, *Observatt. Sacr. in N. T.* ii. 274. *Schl.*]

⁴ [See Th. Gale, *Observv. ad Jamblichum, de Myster. Ægypt.* p. 206; and G. Sale, Preface to *Koran*, p. 72. Even Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* iii. 7, § 2, admits that the Jewish religion was corrupted among the Babylonians. *Schl.*]

§ 6. The more learned, who laid claim to an exact knowledge of the law, and of divine things, were divided into various sects and parties; ¹

¹ Besides the three more noted sects, there were others unquestionably among the Jews. The *Herodians* are mentioned in the sacred volume; the *Gaulonites*, by Josephus; and other sects by Epiphanius, and by Hegesippus in Eusebius; all of which cannot be supposed to be mere fictions. [Mosheim's additional remarks on this subject, in his *Commentt. de Rebb. Chr. &c.* p. 43—45, well deserve insertion here. They are as follows:—'To vindicate my assertion, that Epiphanius's account of the Jewish sects, in the beginning of his book de *Hæresibus*, is not, probably, altogether untrue, I will offer a conjecture, which, the more I consider it, the more important it appears. I propose it for the consideration of the learned. It may, perhaps, serve to remove some obscurities from ancient ecclesiastical history. Epiphanius states, that there was among the Jews a sect of *Hemerobaptists*, who had this peculiarity, that they washed themselves daily. The same sect is mentioned by an ancient writer, Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 22, and by Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 245, ed. Jebb, though the latter abridges the name, calling them *Baptists*. Nor is this sect omitted in the Index of Heresies, falsely ascribed to Jerome. The author of the *Clementina*, Homil. ii. c. 23, says, The founder of the sect was named John, and he had twelve apostles, and thirty chief men, to aid him. The same account occurs in the *Epitome gestorum Petri*, § 26, which is subjoined to the *Clementina*. Either no credit is due to any ancient history, or these numerous and very ancient witnesses, who cannot be suspected of fraud or ignorance, must be believed when they assert that there was a sect among the Jews, called *Hemerobaptists*. Epiphanius's whole story, therefore, is not to be accounted fabulous.

'The descendants of these *Hemerobaptists*, I suspect, are still existing. The learned well know that there is, in Persia and India, a numerous and wide-spread community, who call themselves *Mendai Iahi*, *Disciples of John*. The Europeans call them *Christians of St. John*; because they have some slight knowledge of Christ. By the oriental writers they are called *Sabbi* or *Sabbîm*. Concerning them, Ignatius à Jesu, a Carmelite monk, who lived long among them, has written a book, entitled *Narratio originis, rituum et errorum Christianorum S. Johannis*, &c. Rome, 1652, 8vo. It is no contemptible performance, and contains many things deserving attention;

though it is ill-digested, and unpolished in its style. Besides this, Ignatius, Bart. Herbelot (in *Biblioth. Orient. voce Sabi*), Asseman (*Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vat.*), Thevenot and Tavernier (in their Travels), Engelb. Kæmpfer (*Amœnitatt. exot. fasc. ii. cap. 11*), and very recently, Fourmont (*Hist. of the Paris Acad. of Inscriptions*), and others, have written largely concerning these people. Th. Sig. Bayer proposed writing a book respecting them, which, perhaps, was unfinished at his death. The origin and true character of this sect are still unsettled. That they cannot be classed among Christians is now clear. For, what they know of Christ, they have learned from the Chaldean Christians, among whom many of them live; nor do they worship or honour Christ. Most of the moderns incline to regard them as descended from those *Sabians*, who are so often mentioned in the *Koran* of Mahomet, and by Maimonides. But their customs and their doctrines are wholly different from those attributed to the *Sabians*; and from their being called *Sabians* by the Mahometans, nothing can be inferred; because it is well known that the Arabians apply this name to *all* who reject their religion.

'I am inclined to look upon these *Christians of St. John* as descendants of those *Hemerobaptists*, who were a Jewish sect, about the time of Christ. For this opinion, I offer the following arguments: *First*, They profess to be Jews; and say their ancestors lived on the banks of the Jordan, whence they were driven by the Mahometans. This argument, I consider as overthrowing the hypothesis, which makes them to be *Sabians*. *Secondly*, They place their dependence for pardon and salvation on their frequent bodily ablutions; which was the distinguishing error of the *Hemerobaptists*. At this day, the *Disciples of John*, as they call themselves, are solemnly baptized by their priests, but once a year; whereas, the *Hemerobaptists* *daily* purified themselves with water. But it is a fixed principle with them all, to this day, that the oftener they baptize, the holier and more happy are they; and they, therefore, would all receive baptism every month, nay, every day, if they could. The avarice of their priests, who will not baptize them without a fee, has rendered the repetition of the rite less frequent. *Thirdly*, The founder of this sect, like that of the *Hemerobaptists*, was named John; and has left a book which is preserved with reverence, as being divine. It is commonly supposed that

among which, *three* left the rest far behind in number and authority: namely, the *Pharisees*, the *Sadducees*, and the *Essenes*. The two first are often mentioned in the Scriptures: a knowledge of the *Essenes* we owe to Josephus and Philo. These principal sects agreed, indeed, generally upon those things without which the Jew's religion can nowise stand; but respecting questions of the highest importance, even such as are connected with human salvation, they were engaged in endless contentions. From these how much mischief flowed upon the rude and unlettered populace, anyone will readily discern.

§ 7. They disagreed, first, respecting the *law* itself, or the rule which God had given them. The Pharisees added to the *written* law another, or the *unwritten*, delivered and handed down by word of mouth.¹ This the *Sadducees* and *Essenes* spurned, holding to the

this John was John the *Baptist*, Christ's forerunner, mentioned in the Scriptures. Hence many conclude that the *Sabians* are descended from the disciples of *John the Baptist*. So thought Ignatius à Jesu, *Narratio de Chr. S. Joh. &c.* cap. 2, p. 13, &c. But what this sect relate of their John, as stated by Ignatius himself, clearly show him to be diverse from the *Baptist*. For they deny that their John suffered death under Herod; they say he died a natural death, in a town of Persia, called Sciuster, and was buried in the adjacent fields of that town. They state also, that he had a wife, and four children. Only a few of the things they relate of their John accord with what our Scriptures relate of John the Baptist; and these few things, like what they also say of Christ, they doubtless learned from those Christians with whom they associated to avoid the oppressions of the Mahometans; and finding these things not inconsistent with their faith, and being unable, from their extreme ignorance, to refute them, they embraced and still retain them. What degree of weight this supposition of mine deserves, will better appear when the sacred books of this people, and especially the books said to be written by their founder John, shall be published. These were, a few years since, introduced into the king's library at Paris; so that we may hope the learned will, sooner or later, have access to them.—These sacred books of the Sabians of Hedshar in Persia have been examined with considerable care; see among others M. Norberg, *de Religione et ling. Sabæorum, in Commentt. Societ. Reg. Scient.* Gotting. 1780. The most probable conclusion is, that this people are not to be classed among Jews, Christians, or Mahometans; but are of uncertain origin, and have a religion of their own, compounded of Judaism, Christianity, Parsism,

and Islamism. For a list of the writers who treat of them, see Nösselt's *Anweisung, &c.* § 474; and Stäudlin's *kirchl. Geographie*, ii. 705. Tr.]

¹ [It was said, that when Moses returned from Sinai to his tent, 'he brought both these laws with him, and delivered them unto the people of Israel in this manner. He called Aaron unto him, and first delivered to him *the text*, which was to be *the written law*, and after that the interpretation of it, which was the *oral law*, in the same order as he received both from God in the mount. Then Aaron arising, and seating himself at the right hand of Moses, Eleazar and Ithamar, his sons, went next in, and being taught both these laws at the feet of the prophet, in the same manner as Aaron had been, they also arose and seated themselves, the one on the left hand of Moses, and the other on the right hand of Aaron; and then the seventy elders, who constituted the *Sanhedrim*, or great senate of the nation, went in, and being taught by Moses both these laws in the same manner, they also seated themselves in the tent; and then entered in all such of the people as were desirous of knowing the law of God, and were taught in the same manner: after this, Moses withdrawing, Aaron repeated the whole of both laws, as he had heard it from him, and also withdrew; and then Eleazar and Ithamar repeated the same; and on their withdrawing, the seventy elders made the same repetition to the people then present; so that, each of them having heard both these laws repeated to them four times, they all had it thereby firmly fixed in their memories: and that they then dispersed themselves among the whole congregation, and communicated to all the people of Israel what had thus been delivered unto them by the prophet of God: that they did put the text into writing, but the inter-

written law alone. They differed also respecting the *import of the law*. For while the Pharisees sought a *double sense* in Scripture, one obvious and of the *words*, another recondite and of the *things*, the *Sadducees* taught that nothing is contained in the law besides that which the words imply. Differing from both, the *Essenes* generally considered the *words* of the law as in themselves quite unimportant, and the *things* expressed by them as images of sacred and heavenly things. To these were added other contests of equal importance, especially on the law's punishments and rewards; which the Pharisees, referring them both to body and soul, carried beyond this life, but the Sadducees thought them bounded by it. The Essenes took a middle course, admitting future rewards and punishments, but confining them to their souls; bodies being considered as made of malignant matter for the imprisonment of souls.¹

§ 8. Although these factions disputed with each other upon points of so much moment, mutual injuries do not appear to have been inflicted by them on religious grounds. This forbearance, however, no one acquainted with those times will ascribe to generous and well-founded principles. The Sadducees depended for influence and authority upon the upper classes, the Pharisees upon the people. It was, therefore, scarcely possible with either sect to make a hostile attack upon the other without very great hazard. If, too, they had attempted any movement of a political tendency, the Romans would unquestionably have inflicted no light punishment on those who broke the peace. The Sadducees, we may add, were well-mannered people, averse from all disturbance and altercation by the very discipline which they followed.²

§ 9. The *Essenes* could more easily avoid contention with the others, because they lived, for the most part, in retired places, and remote from intercourse with mankind. This sect, which was dispersed over Syria, Egypt, and the neighbouring countries, looked upon religion as placed in silence and meditation; and endeavoured, by a stricter kind of life, and by various observances, borrowed, it would seem, from the Egyptians,³ to attain a higher degree of virtue. Yet they were not all of the same sentiments. Some lived in celibacy, and made it their care to instruct and educate the children of others. Others married wives—not to gratify their natural propensities, but solely to propagate

pretation of it they delivered down only by word of mouth to the succeeding generations.'—Prideaux, *Connexions*, Lond. 1720, i. 256. S.]

¹ [For an account of the three Jewish sects, see Ja. Trigland, *Syntagma Trium Scriptorum illustrium* (viz. Jo. Scaliger, Joh. Drusius, and Nicol. Serarius), *de Judæorum Sectis*, Delft, 1702, 2 vols. 4to. After these, Ja. Basnage, Hum. Prideaux (in their Jewish histories), and the authors of *Introductions to the books of the N. Test.* (and of works on *Jewish Antiquities*), and many others, have described these sects,

some more, and some less successfully. Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ.* &c. p. 46.]

² [See *Commentt. de Rebb. Chr.* &c. p. 48, where Dr. M. proves from Josephus (*Antiq. Jud.* xviii. 1, and xiii. 10), that the Sadducees were all men of wealth; and (from his *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8) that they had little sympathy for others. Dr. M. thinks he finds the picture of a Sadducee in the rich man described, Luke xvi. 19. *Schl.*]

³ See Lu. Holstenius, *Notes on Porphyry, de Vita Pythagoræ*, p. 11, ed. Kuster.

the human race.¹ Those who lived in Syria held that God may be propitiated by victims and sacrifices, although they must be offered in a very different manner from that which prevailed among the Jews: whence it appears, *they* did not reject wholly the Mosaic law in its literal sense. But such as dwelt in the desert parts of Egypt denied that any other sacrifice was required by God than a composed mind given up to meditation on heavenly things: which shows that *they* put an allegorical sense upon the whole Jewish law.²

§ 10. The *Therapeutæ*, of whom *Philo* wrote a whole book,³ are commonly reckoned a branch of the *Essene* family; whence arose that well-known distinction of the Essenes into *practical* and *theoretical*. But whether this classification is correct may be doubted. For I can see nothing in the customs or institutions of the *Therapeutæ* from which it can certainly be collected that they sprang from the Essenes, nor has *Philo* so represented them. Who can deny that other fanatical Jews, besides Essenes, might have come together and formed a society? But I agree entirely with those who think the *Therapeutæ* to have been Jews, desirous of passing for true disciples of Moses, not Christians, or Egyptians. In reality, they were wild and melancholy enthusiasts, who led a life equally removed from the law of Moses and right reason.⁴

¹ [Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, § 13. *Schl.*]

² See Mosheim's note on Cudworth's Essay, *de vera Notione cænæ Domini*, p. 4, subjoined to his *Intellectual System*.

³ *Philo*, *de Vita contemplativa*, in his Works, p. 889.

⁴ The principal writers concerning the *Therapeutæ* are mentioned by J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Salutar. Evang. toti orbi exor.* c. iv. p. 55. [The *Therapeutæ* wished to pass for disciples of Moses, notwithstanding their wide departure from him. They gave up all their property, and betook themselves to retired situations, where they lived in solitary huts, without sacrifices, without any external worship, and without labour; mortifying their bodies by fasting, and their souls by unceasing contemplation, in order to bring their heaven-born spirits, now imprisoned in bodies, into light and liberty, and fit them better for the celestial mansions after death. They assembled together every seventh day of the week; when, after hearing a discourse, and offering prayers, they ate together, feeding on salt and bread and water. This meal was followed by a sacred dance, which they protracted through the night, and till the dawn of day. At first, the men and women danced apart; afterwards, guided by inspiration, they danced together, and laboured, by violent movements, outcries, songs, and voices, to express the love of God then working in their souls. Into such follies can human nature run, when ignorant of God and of the nature of man. It is still debated

whether these *Therapeutæ* were Christians, Jews, or heathen philosophers. Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 17) regarded them as Christian monks, established in Egypt by St. Mark; and many Romish writers, to support the high antiquity of monkery, defend this opinion. The whole of this controversy may be seen in the *Lettres pour et contre la fameuse question, si les solitaires appelés Therapeutes, dont a parlé Philon le Juif, étoient Chrétiens*. Paris, 1712, 12mo. The chief advocates of this opinion are B. de Montfaucon, in the Notes to his French translation of *Philo*, and M. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 332. On the other hand, Scaliger, Chamier, Lightfoot, Daillé, the two Basnages, Prideaux, Ittig, Buddeus, Mosheim, Baumgarten, and recently J. A. Orsi (*Hist. Eccles.* i. 77), and Mangey (Preface to *Philo's Works*), have maintained that they were *Jews*, and of the sect of *Essenes*. J. J. Lange, in a Dissert. published in 1721, maintained, upon very slender grounds, that they were *oriental philosophers*, of melancholy temperament, who had imbibed some Jewish notions. And Jablonsky, in an essay on the subject, accounts these solitaries *Egyptian priests*, addicted to astrology and other sacred sciences of the Egyptians. Mosheim, *de Rebb. Chr.* p. 46, &c. abridged by Schlegel.—Mosheim pertinently observes (*Com. de Rebb. &c.* p. 50), 'The Christian monks, who evidently originated in Egypt, borrowed their peculiarities from the *practical Essenes*; for nothing can be more similar than the rules and regulations

§ 11. It was impossible that any one of these sects should inculcate and promote true piety and virtue. The *Pharisees*, as our Saviour often lays to their charge, disregarding internal purity, by a certain vain ostentation, and an austere kind of life, sought popular applause: they ascribed also more authority to the inventions and institutions of older times than to God's most holy precepts.¹ The *Sadducees* gave strength to iniquity and every lust, by discarding future rewards and punishments. The *Essenes*, a fanatical and superstitious tribe, making piety consist in a holy sort of idleness and contempt of the human race, loosened the ties that bind men to each other.

§ 12. When those who assumed the name and the prerogatives of *the wise* were involved in such darkness and altercations, who can doubt that the people's religion and piety were utterly debased? Sunk in total ignorance of heavenly things, the humbler classes reckoned upon pleasing God by due attention to the sacrifices, ablutions, and other ceremonies prescribed by Moses. From this twofold source flowed those polluted morals and that profligate life which characterised the greater part of the Jews while Christ lived among them.² Hence our Saviour compared *the people* to sheep wandering without a shepherd;³ and *their teachers* to blind men who would show a way to others which they do not know themselves.⁴

§ 13. To these stains on the character of the Jews when Christ came among them must be added, upon all accounts, the fondness of many among them for the theory of the world's origin, which was taught by the oriental philosophers, and for the *Cabbala*,⁵ as their nation calls it, that philosophy's most indubitable offspring. That many Jews *were* infected with this system, both the sacred books of the New Testament, and the early history of Christian affairs, will allow no one to disbelieve.⁶ It is also certain that the founders of several Gnostic sects were Jews. The followers of this philosophy must necessarily have differed from the other Jews in their views of the God of the Old Testament, as also of Moses, of the creation, and of the Messiah. For they held the creator of the world to be a different being from the Supreme God; and believed, that the Messiah was to destroy the domination of the former over the human race.

of the ancient monks, and those of the *Essenes*, as described by Josephus. On the other hand, the Christian *solitaries*, called *Eremites*, copied after the *theoretical Essenes*, or *Therapeutæ*.⁷ Tr.—‘*Essenes*, in Egyptian, means *physicians* (of the soul); in Greek, *Θεραπευταί*, *Therapeutæ*.’ Hey’s *Lectures in Divinity*, i. 260. S.]

¹ Matt. xxiii. 13, &c.

² [A striking passage relative to the vicious lives of the Jews in our Saviour's time, occurs in Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* x. 13, § 6. Schl.]

³ Matt. x. 6, xv. 24.

⁴ Matt. xv. 14. John ix. 39.

⁵ [‘Although the word *cabbala* be now restrained to signify the mystical interpretations of the Scriptures only, and, in the common usage of speech now among the Jews, they alone are called *Cabbalists* who give themselves up to these dotages, yet, in the true and genuine meaning of the word, the *Cabbala* extends to all manner of traditions, which are of the interpretative part of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the *Cabbalists* is the general name of all those who professed the study and knowledge of them.’—Prideaux, *Connexions*, i. 278. S.]

⁶ See J. C. Wolf, *Biblioth. Ebraica*, vol. ii. l. vii. c. i. § 9, p. 206.

From such opinions arose a monstrous system, widely different from the genuine religion of the Jews.

§ 14. The outward *forms* of worship established by Moses were less corrupted than the other parts of religion. Yet very learned men have observed that various rites were introduced even into the temple itself, for any traces of which we may vainly seek in the divine laws. After the Jews, in fact, saw the sacred rites, as well of the neighbouring nations as of the Greeks and Romans, not a few ceremonies, with which the gods were worshipped, seemed so attractive as to overcome the fear of adopting them, and of making them ornamental additions, as it were, to the rites of God's appointment.¹

§ 15. Various *causes* may be assigned for this great corruption of a nation which God had selected for his peculiar people. In the first place, their fathers had brought back with them from Chaldea and the adjacent countries into Palestine many foolish and vain opinions, wholly unknown to the founders of the nation.² From the time, too, when Alexander the Great conquered Asia, the manners and opinions of the Greeks had found a passage not only to the Persians, Syrians, and Arabians, but likewise to the Jews, who were before unacquainted with literature and philosophy.³ The journeys also commonly made by individuals of their nation into neighbouring countries, especially Egypt and Phœnicia, in quest of gain, caused various errors and fancies of the pagan nations to spread among the Hebrews. Lastly, *Herod* the Great and his sons, as likewise the Roman procurators and soldiers, undoubtedly planted in the country many foreign institutions and pollutions. Other causes will readily occur to those who are not unskilled in Jewish history from the times of the Maccabees.

§ 16. But, notwithstanding their numerous faults, the people universally professed great fondness for the law of Moses, and carefully guarded it from the least curtailment: hence were erected over all the country sacred buildings, known by the Greek name of *Synagogues*, in which the people met for prayer and for hearing public expounders of the law. Nor were the greater towns without schools, in which lettered men taught youth both divine and human knowledge.⁴ These institutions, no one can doubt, must have done much to keep the law inviolate, and to check in some degree the growth of ripening vices.

§ 17. The Samaritans, who worshipped on mount Gerizim, were oppressed by the same evils as the Jews, though otherwise divided from them by a virulent hostility, nor were they less the authors of their own calamities. It appears, from the history of those times, that Samaritan society was not behind Jewish in suffering from the machinations of factious men, although it had not, perhaps, an equal

¹ See Joh. Spencer, *de Legibus ritual. veter. Ebraeorum*, t. ii. lib. iv., where he treats particularly of Jewish rites, borrowed from the Gentiles, and not to be found in the law of God.

² See Tho. Gale, on Jamblichus *de myste-*

riis Egyptiorum, p. 206. Nor does Josephus conceal this fact, *Ant. Jud.* iii. 7, § 2.

³ [Le Clerc, *Epist. Crit.* ix. p. 250. *Schl.*]

⁴ See Camp. Vitringa, *de Synagoga Veteri*, l. iii. c. v. and l. i. c. v. vii. [Prideaux, *Connexions*, &c. pt. i. b. vi. anno 445. *Tr.*]

number of religious sects. That this people's religion was worse than the Jewish, Christ himself signifies.¹ Yet they seem to have had more correct views of the offices of the Messiah than the greater part of the Jews.² Upon the whole, although everything related by the Jews of their opinions cannot be taken as the truth, yet it is undeniable, that the Samaritans adulterated the pure doctrines of the Old Testament with a profane alloy of pagan errors.³

§ 18. The narrow limits of Palestine could not contain a nation so very numerous as the Jews. Hence, when our Saviour was born, there was hardly any considerable province, in which were not found many of that people who lived by traffic and other arts. These Jews, in countries out of Palestine, were protected against popular violence and injuries, by the laws and by the injunctions of the magistrates.⁴ Yet they were, in most places, exceedingly odious to the mass of people, on account of their striking singularity in religion and manners. Upon the whole, it came undoubtedly from a special providence of the great Supreme, that a people which had the guardianship of true religion, the worship, namely, of one God, should be spread over nearly all the earth, as if to shame superstition everywhere by their example, and in a manner to prepare the way for Christian truth.

CHAPTER III.

THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST.

§ 1. The birth of Christ — § 2. His childhood and youth — § 3. His precursor, John B. — § 4. His subsequent life — § 5. He appoints twelve apostles, and seventy disciples — § 6. Reason of this number — § 7. Fame of Christ out of Judea — § 8. Success of his ministry — § 9. His death — § 10. His resurrection and ascension to heaven.

§ 1. So many and so virulent diseases of the human race demanded a divine physician. From heaven, therefore, when Herod the Great's reign was near its close, did God's own Son descend in Palestine, and, assuming human nature, became a spectacle to mortals of a teacher that could not err, and who besides, although their king, should answer for them in the divine judgment-hall. In what year salvation thus shone upon the world, the most persevering efforts of

¹ John iv. 22.

² John iv. 25.

³ The principal writers concerning the Samaritans, are enumerated by J. G. Carpov, *Critica Sacra Vet. Test.* pt. ii. cap. vi. p. 595. [The most valuable are Chr. Cellarius, *Hist. gentis Samarit.* in his *Diss. Acad.* p. 109, &c. Joh. Morin, *Antiq. Eccles. orient.* Ja. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, t. ii. lib. ii. c. 1—13. H. Reland, *de Samaritanis*, in his *Diss. Miscell.* pt. ii. (H. Pri-

deaux, *Connexions*), and Baumgarten, *Geschichte der Religionspart.* p. 274, &c. Schl.]

⁴ See Ja. Gronovius, *Decreta Romana et Asiatica pro Judæis, ad cultum divinum per Asiæ Minoris urbes secure obeundum*, Lugd. Bat. 1712, 8vo. [For a candid and faithful account of the state of the Jews, both in Palestine and out of it, the English reader is referred to Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel History*, pt. i. vol. i. ch. ii.—vi. Tr.]

very learned men have as yet been unable to ascertain. Nor will this surprise us, if we consider that the earliest Christians knew not the *day* of their Saviour's birth, and judged differently of the subject.¹ But of what consequence is it that we know not the year or day when this light first shone, since we fully know that it *has* appeared, and that nothing need prevent us from enjoying its brilliancy and warmth?

§ 2. An account of the birth, lineage, family, and parents of Christ, is left us by the four inspired writers who give the history of his life. But they say very little respecting his childhood and youth. While yet of tender age, he passed into Egypt with his parents, to escape Herod's cruelty.² When twelve years of age, he disputed publicly in the temple, with the most learned Jewish doctors, upon religious subjects. Afterwards, till he was thirty years of age, he lived with his parents, as a good and obedient son.³ Divine wisdom has not seen fit to give us more particulars; nor is it certain — though many think it so — that Christ worked at the trade of his foster-father

¹ Most of the opinions of the learned, concerning the year of Christ's birth, are collected by J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliographia Antiquar.* cap. vii. § ix. p. 187.—[Consult also the elaborate Chronologists, Scaliger, Petavius, Ussher, &c., and the eccles. Historians, Natalis Alexander, Pagi, &c. The birth of Christ was first made an era, from which to reckon dates, by Dionysius Exiguus, about A.D. 532. He supposed Christ to have been born on the 25th December, A.U.C. 753, Lentulus and Piso consuls. And this computation has been followed, in practice, to this day; although the learned are well agreed, that it must be incorrect. To ascertain the true date, there are *two principal data*, afforded by the Evangelists. I. It is clear, from Matt. ii. 1, &c. that Christ was born *before* the death of Herod the Great, who died about Easter, A.U.C. 749 or 750. (Lardner, *Credibility*, &c. pt. i. vol. ii. Appendix.) Now, if Christ was born in the December next before Herod's death, it must have been A.U.C. 748 or 749; and of course, four, if not five years anterior to the Dionysian or vulgar era. II. It is probable, from Lu. iii. 1, 2, 23, that Jesus was about thirty years of age, in the 15th year of Tiberius Cæsar. Now the reign of Tiberius may be considered as commencing when he became sole emperor, in August A.U.C. 767; or (as there is some reason to suppose, that Augustus made him partner in the government *two* years before he died) in A.U.C. 765. The 15th year of Tiberius will, therefore, be either A.U.C. 781, or 779. From which deduct 30, and we have A.U.C. 751, or 749, for the year of Christ's birth; the former *two*, and the latter *four* years *earlier* than the Dionysian computation.—Comparing these results with

those obtained from the death of Herod, it is generally supposed the true era of Christ's birth was A.U.C. 749, or four years before the vulgar era. But the conclusion is not certain, because there is uncertainty in the data. (1) It is not certain, that we ought to reckon Tiberius' reign as beginning two years before the death of Augustus. (2) Luke says '*about* thirty years of age.' This is indefinite, and may be understood of 29, 30, or 31 years. (3) It is not certain in which of the two years mentioned Herod died; nor *how long* before that event the Saviour was born. Respecting the *month* and *day* of Christ's birth, we are left almost wholly to conjecture. The disagreement of the early fathers is evidence that the day was not celebrated as a festival in the apostolic times. *Tr.*—The particulars of this disagreement may be seen in Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, ii. 302, Lond. 1726. It is, undoubtedly, not possible to prove that the festival was observed under the apostles, although many learned men have been of that opinion; but of its very high antiquity there is no question; and one reason of the uncertainty respecting it may have come from the varying usages of the East and the West. The former celebrated all in one day, viz. the 6th of January, Christ's incarnation, the star that shone over the place of his nativity, the appearance of the Holy Ghost at his baptism, and the manifestation of his divinity by the change of water into wine, at Cana of Galilee. The Latin Church celebrated the nativity on the 25th of December, and the Epiphany as a distinct festival. *S.*]

² Matt. ii. 13.

³ Luke ii. 51, 52.

Joseph, who was a carpenter. Nevertheless, there were anciently vain and false-hearted persons, who ventured to fill up this obscure part of our Saviour's life with extravagant and ridiculous fables.¹

§ 3. In the thirtieth year of his age, he entered on the offices for which he came into the world. To render his ministry more useful to the Jews, John, the son of a Jewish priest, a man grave and venerable in his whole manner of life, was commissioned by God to proclaim the advent of the Messiah promised to the fathers. He called himself the Messiah's *precursor*, and, warmed with holy zeal, he admonished the Jews to put away their vices and purify their minds, that they might become worthy of his benefits, now that the Son of God was coming, nay, rather, that he had actually come. He likewise initiated into the Saviour's approaching kingdom, those who promised amendment of mind and life, by immersion in the river.² And by this John, it pleased even Jesus himself to be lustrated, as others were, in the waters of the Jordan, that he should show no neglect, according to his own words, of anything that Jewish authority and law required.³

§ 4. It is not necessary to enter here into a particular detail of the life and actions of Jesus Christ. All Christians know, that for more than three years, amidst great sorrows, molestations, snares, and perils, he instructed the Jewish people in the counsels and purposes of the Most High; nothing having been omitted by him which might allure either the rude and ignorant populace, or the wiser men; that he led a life so holy and spotless as to defy even every suspicion; finally, that by stupendous miracles, of a salutary and beneficial character, exactly suitable to his healing mission, he placed beyond all controversy the truth of that religion which was thus offered to mankind.

§ 5. As this religion was to be propagated throughout the world, it was necessary for him to select some persons for his constant companions and intimates; who should be able to state and testify to posterity, and to the remotest nations, with the greatest assurance and authority, the events of his life, his miracles, and his whole system of doctrine. Therefore, from the Jews about him, he chose twelve messengers, whom he distinguished from the rest by title of *Apostles*. They were plebeians, poor, and illiterate; for he would not employ the rich, the eloquent, and the learned, lest the success of their mission should be ascribed to human and natural causes.⁴ These he once sent forth among the Jews, during his lifetime;⁵ but afterwards, he retained them constantly near him, that they might

¹ See a collection of these fables by J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus N. Test.* t. i. [The works here referred to, are the Gospel of the nativity of Mary: the Previous Gospel, ascribed to James the Just: the Gospel of the infancy of Christ, ascribed to Thomas: the Gospel of the infancy, &c. translated from the Arabic; all of which are full of marvellous tales of miracles and prodigies. *Tr.*]

² Matt. iii. 2. John i. 22.

³ [See, concerning John the Baptist, Chr. Cellarius, two *Diss. de vita, carcere et supplicio Jo. Bapt.* in his *Diss. Acad.* pt. i. p. 169, and pt. ii. p. 373. Tho. Ittig, *Historiæ eccles. primi sæculi selecta capita*, cap. 8, sect. 4, and Witsius, *Miscell. Sacra*, ii. 464, &c. *Schl.* — Also G. B. Winer, *Bibli-sches Realwörterbuch*, article *Johannes*, *Tr.*]

⁴ 1 Cor. i. 21.

⁵ Matt. x. 7.

witness all that he said or did.¹ But, that the people might not want religious instruction, he commissioned seventy other disciples, to travel at large through Judea.²

§ 6. The learned have inquired why the Saviour appointed just *twelve*, neither more or less, to be apostles; and *seventy* to be his disciples; and various conjectures are offered on the subject.

But as it is manifest from the words of *Christ* himself,³ that the number of the apostles had reference to the number of the tribes of Israel, there can scarcely be a doubt that he wished to indicate to the Jews, that he was the supreme Lord and Pontiff of the whole Hebrew race, which was divided into twelve tribes. The seventy disciples were just equal in number to the senators, composing the Sanhedrim, or grand council of the nation: and this justifies the conjecture that *Christ* intended, by the choice of the *seventy*, to admonish the Jews that the authority of their Sanhedrim was now at an end, and that all power in relation to religious matters, was vested in him alone.⁴

§ 7. Jesus himself gave instruction to none but Jews; nor did he allow his disciples to travel among other nations, as teachers, while he continued on earth.⁵ Yet the extraordinary deeds performed by him, leave no room to doubt that his fame, very early, extended to other nations. There are respectable writers, who state that *Abgarus*, king of Edessa, being dangerously sick, sent a letter to Christ, imploring his assistance; and that he not only wrote an answer to the king, but also sent him his picture.⁶ It is, however, the prevailing opinion that not only the letters of Christ, and *Abgarus*, but likewise the whole story, are fabrications.⁷ I would by no means venture

¹ [The title *Apostles* was given to those principal men, whom the high priests retained as their private counsellors; and whom they occasionally sent as their legates to the foreign Jews; either to collect the yearly tax for the temple, or to execute other commissions. We have not, indeed, a direct testimony at hand, proving that the title of *apostles* was given to such legates of the high priests in the days of Christ. Yet there is intimation of this in Gal. i. 1, and Jerome so understood the passage. See his *Comment.*, &c., *Opp.* ix. 124. And that after the destruction of Jerusalem, the legates of the Jewish Patriarchs (who stood in the place of high priests) were called apostles, is fully proved. See Jerome, *ubi supra*, and Eusebius on *Isa.* ch. xviii. 2. See also Ja. Godefroi on *Cod. Theodos.* vi. 251, ed. Ritter. Dion. Petavius, on *Epiphan. ad Hæres.* xxx. P. Wesseling, *de Archontibus Jud.* p. 91. — From Mosheim *de Reb. Chr.* &c. p. 69. See also Walch (of Götting.) *Hist. Patriarch. Jud.*; and Suicer, *Thesaur. Eccles.* i. 477. *Tr.*]

² Luke x. 1.

³ Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30.

⁴ [There are two factitious lists of the

seventy disciples now extant; which are falsely ascribed to Hippolytus, and to Dositheus. They may be seen in various works; e.g. J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Evang.* &c. pp. 115—118, and annexed to the books *de Vita et Morte Mosis*, ed. Fabricius; and in T. Ittig, *Hist. Eccles. primi. sæcul.* p. 472. That no sort of credit is due to them, is shown by Ittig, *ubi supra*; by D. Blondell, *de Episcopis et Presbyt.* p. 93, and by others. Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 12, expressly declares, that no catalogue of the seventy disciples was to be found anywhere, in his day. The two lists nearly agree; and are evidently made up by collecting together, without the least judgment, nearly all the names of Christians mentioned in the N. Testament, and particularly in the salutations of Paul. *Tr.*]

⁵ Matt. x. 5, 6; xv. 24.

⁶ Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 18. [Here is the earliest notice of these *Letters*. For the earliest history of the *picture*, see Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 27. See the *Letters* themselves, with notes in] J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* i. 317.

⁷ Ja. Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, i. c. 18, p. 500. T. S. Bayer, *Historia Edessena et Osroëna*, iii. 104. J. S. Asseman, *Biblioth.*

to support the credit of the letters; but I see no very weighty reason why the thing itself may not be considered as true upon the whole.

§ 8. There was, indeed, no small number of the Jews, who, moved by so many signs of divine authority in *Christ*, looked up to him as the Son of God: but the leading men, especially the Pharisees and chief priests, whose crimes and vices he freely reprov'd, plotted against his life; being fearful of losing their honours and privileges, if *Christ* should continue publicly to teach. Long were the machinations of this wicked crew vain and fruitless. But *Judas*, an ungrateful disciple, disclosing the place of his master's nocturnal retirement, he was seized by soldiers, at the command of the Sanhedrim, and orders were given for trying him capitally.

§ 9. He was first arraigned before the Jewish high priest and senate, upon a charge of doing violence to the majesty and law of God. Dragged thence to the tribunal of *Pilate*, the Roman procurator, he was there accused of sedition, and of treason against Cæsar. Neither of these accusations could have satisfied fair and upright judges. But the people's clamour, which an impious priesthood stirred up, compelled *Pilate*, against his own conviction, to pass a capital sentence upon our Saviour. Having come into our world to make expiation for the sins of men, and knowing that all the objects of his abode among them were accomplished, he voluntarily submitted to be nailed to a cross, on which was yielded up his spotless soul to God.

§ 10. On the third day after his burial, he re-assumed the life, which he had voluntarily laid down; and coming forth in human shape, he made it plain that God's justice could no longer claim a debt from men. He now continued forty days with his disciples, employing the time very much in giving them instruction. To his enemies he would not visibly appear; as well for other reasons, as because he knew, that men, so unprincipled as to accuse him long ago of sorcery, would resolutely say, that some spectre had arisen, which bore his form, and came from an evil spirit's power. At length, while the disciples watched his movements, he went from their presence up into heaven, having first entrusted them with an embassy to the human race.

orient. Clem. Vat. i. 554. ['As to the picture, which is still preserved, and shown at Rome, Is. Beausobre has fully exposed the

fable, in his *Dis. des Images de main divine; in the Biblioth. Germanique*, xviii. 10, &c.'].
Mosheim de Rebus Chr. &c. p. 73.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Effusion of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles—§ 2. They preach to Jews and Samaritans—§ 3. Election of a new apostle—§ 4. Paul's conversion—§ 5. Attention to the poor, and a community of goods, in the church—§ 6. Many churches planted by the apostles—§ 7. Respect for Christ among the pagans—§ 8. Causes of the rapid progress of Christianity—§ 9. Extraordinary gifts of the early Christians—§ 10. Fictitious causes assigned for the progress of Christianity.

§ 1. WHEN *Jesus* was seated at the right hand of the eternal Father, he gave the first proof of his majesty and power on the fiftieth day¹ after his death, by the effusion of the Holy Spirit, upon his disciples and friends on earth.² On receiving this celestial gift and teacher, they were freed from all their former ignorance and blindness of mind, and endued with astonishing alacrity and power to fulfil the duties of their office. With these mental endowments, was joined the knowledge of various foreign languages; which was indispensable to them in giving instruction to different nations; and also a firm reliance on the promise of *Christ*, that God would aid them, as often as should be necessary, by miracles.³

§ 2. Relying on these heavenly aids, they first, as our Saviour had enjoined, sought converts among the Jews.⁴ Nor was this labour without effect, for many thousands of them soon became Christians.⁵ Next going to the Samaritans, which also their commission required,⁶ they gathered among them too a Christian church.⁷ Lastly, after spending many years at Jerusalem, and settling and confirming the churches of Christ in Palestine and the neighbouring regions, they went away to various nations of the globe, their labours meeting everywhere with very great success.⁸

¹ [From the terms here used by Mosheim, it would seem that he supposed the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost took place on the Jewish sabbath, or *Saturday*; and not on *Sunday*, as many have supposed. *Tr.*]

² Acts ii. 1.

³ [Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 76, states, that he does not account the power of working miracles among the supernatural gifts; because such power neither was, nor could be, conferred on men, Omnipotence alone being able to work miracles; so that, *faith* to pray for them, and to expect them, at the hands of God, was all

that the Holy Ghost actually imparted to the apostles. *Tr.*]

⁴ Luke xxiv. 47; Acts i. 8; xiii. 46.

⁵ Acts ii. 41; iv. 4.

⁶ Acts i. 8.

⁷ Acts viii. 14.

⁸ [It appears from the book of *Acts*, that the apostles, or at least most of them, remained in and near Jerusalem, for several years after the ascension; but how long they continued together is uncertain. There was anciently a tradition, which Eusebius states (*H. E.* v. 18), on the authority of Apollonius, a writer of the second century, as does Clemens Alex. (*Strom.* vi. c. 5) from

§ 3. The first care of the apostles after our Saviour's ascension, was to make up their number to twelve, according to Christ's own precedent, by electing a holier person to the place of Judas, who had laid violent hands on himself. Therefore, the little company of *Christ's* servants at Jerusalem being assembled, two men highly conspicuous for piety and faith in *Christ*, *Barnabas* and *Matthias*, were proposed as the most worthy of that office. One of these, *Matthias*, either by lot, which is the general opinion, or by a majority of the suffrages of the persons present, was constituted the twelfth apostle.¹

§ 4. As all these twelve ambassadors of *Christ* were plain, unlettered men, while the Christian community, though still in its infancy, needed a man who could attack and overcome both Jewish doctors and Gentile philosophers with weapons of their own; *Jesus Christ* himself, soon after the appointment of *Matthias*, by a voice from heaven, created a thirteenth apostle. This was *Saul*, who subsequently chose the name of *Paul*, and who had been a most virulent enemy of the Christians, but in whom a first-rate skill in Jewish learning was combined with a knowledge of the Grecian.² To this truly admirable man, whether we consider his courage, his force of mind, or his patience and fortitude under difficulties, how much the Christian world is indebted, every body knows from the *Acts of the Apostles* and his own *Epistles*.

§ 5. The first of all the Christian churches founded by the apostles, was that of Jerusalem: after the form and model of which all the others of that age were constituted. That church, however, was governed immediately by the apostles; to whom were subject both the *presbyters*, and those who took care of the poor, or *deacons*. Though the people had not withdrawn themselves from the Jewish worship, yet they held their own separate meetings; in which they received instruction from the apostles and presbyters; poured forth united prayers; kept up, in the sacred supper, a remembrance of *Jesus Christ*, of his death, and of the salvation gotten by him; lastly, manifested their mutual love, partly by liberality to the poor, partly by those temperate repasts, which from their design were called *love-feasts*.³

a spurious work, *Prædicatio Petri* — that the Saviour enjoined upon his apostles not to leave Jerusalem till twelve years after his ascension. *About* so long they probably continued there: and their being divinely guided, in most of their movements, might give rise to the tradition. *Tr.*]

¹ Acts i. 15.

[Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c.* pp. 78 — 80, aims to prove, that *ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν*, in Acts i. 26, signifies *they gave their votes*; and not, as it is commonly understood, *they cast their lots*. But his interpretation is very generally rejected. *Tr.*]

² Acts ix. 1.

³ Acts ii. 42. [Mosheim understood this text as descriptive of the several parts of the *ordinary public worship* of these

primitive Christians, rather than of their *Christian character and conduct* in general. See his *Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 113 — 116. If Mosheim's interpretation of that text is erroneous, as most interpreters think it is, this account of the mode of worship in the apostolic church, rests on a slender basis. *Tr.*—Mosheim's notion of primitive worship, founded upon this text, is, that it consisted of preaching, a collection for the poor, analogous to the offertory collections of later times, the administration of the Eucharist, and prayer. The principal difficulty in fixing this construction upon the words of St. Luke here, lies upon the second member in the series. The original word is *κοινωνία*, which our translators have rendered *fellowship*, and

Among the virtues by which this first family of our Saviour's was distinguished, that which soonest struck attention was care for the needy and distressed. For the richer members liberally supplied what the necessities of their brethren required, and moreover with such a ready mind, that Luke writes of the goods of all as common to all.¹ These words, though commonly understood as implying community of *possessions*, have been so taken without sufficient inquiry, as is manifest both from St. Peter's words,² and other things. They mean only community of use.³

§ 6. The ambassadors of Christ, leaving Jerusalem, travelled over a great part of the world; and in a short time collected numerous religious societies in various countries. Of churches founded by them, not a small number is mentioned in the sacred books, especially in the *Acts* of the apostles.⁴ Besides these, there can be no doubt, they collected many others; both by their own efforts, and by the efforts of their followers. But how far they travelled, what nations they visited, or when and where they died, is exceedingly dubious and uncertain.⁵ The stories often told respecting their travels among

which Grotius takes to mean *religious conference*, but which is used, both in the New Testament and elsewhere, for an eleemosynary contribution. See Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. xiii. 16; and Suicer *in voc. Κοινωνία*. S.]

¹ Acts ii. 44; iv. 32.

² Acts v. 4.

³ ['It is an ancient opinion, though not older than the fourth century, that in the church of Jerusalem there was such a *community of goods*, as existed among the ancient Essenes, and now among monks. But this opinion is destitute of any solid foundation; resting solely on the declaration of Luke, that they had all things common. See my *Diss. de vera natura communionis bonorum in ecclesia Hierosolym.*, which is the first in the second volume of my *Dissert. ad historiam eccl. pertinentes*.' Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 118.]

⁴ The names of these churches are collected by P. J. Hartmann, *de Rebus gestis Christianor. sub Apostolis*, c. vii. p. 107; and by J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Evang.* &c. c. v. p. 83, &c.

⁵ [It is a very ancient and current report, confirmed by many witnesses, that all the apostles suffered public martyrdom, with the exception of St. John, who died a natural death at Ephesus. And this opinion is so firmly believed by many who would not be thought credulous, that to call it in question, is to run some hazard of being charged with slandering those holy men. Such as please, may believe the account; but let them not be offended, if I declare the martyrdom of

most of the apostles to be less certain than they suppose. That Peter, Paul, and James died violent deaths, I believe, on the testimony of the numerous ancient authors; but that the other apostles did so, I cannot feel so certain. As my first ground of doubt, a very ancient writer of the second century, Heracleon, a Valentinian, indeed, but no contemptible man, cited by Clemens Alex. *Strom.* l. iv. c. 9, denies that Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and others, confessed Christ before magistrates, and were put to death for so doing. He is urging, that the public confession of himself required by the Saviour, Matt. x. 32, may be made by a holy and Christian *life*, as well as by a public avowal before a persecuting magistrate; and he states as proof, Οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ σωζόμενοι ὡμολόγησαν τὴν διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὡμολογίαν, καὶ ἐξῆλθον. Ἐξ ὧν Ματθαῖος, Φίλιππος, Θαμᾶς, Λευὶς, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, *for not all that were saved, made that confession in words* (before magistrates), and so died. Of this number was Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many others. Clement, though he disapproves several things in the passage he quotes, leaves this statement to stand as it is; which is proof that he had nothing to allege against it. —Philip is expressly declared not to have suffered martyrdom, but to have died and been buried at Hierapolis; so says Polycrates, in his Epistle to Victor, in Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 24. Baronius, indeed (*Annals*, A.D. 35, § 141), and after him many others, maintain, that this was not *Philip the Apostle*, but Philip, one of the seven deacons of Jerusalem. But Polycrates says

the Gauls, the Britons, the Spaniards, the Germans, the Americans, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Russians, are too recent and unsubstantial to be received by an inquisitive lover of the truth.¹ A

expressly, that he was *one of the twelve apostles*.—A still stronger argument is, that all the writers of the three first centuries, and among them such as contended for the high dignity of the martyrs, in opposition to the Valentinians, viz. Tertullian, Clemens Alex., and Origen, never mention but *three* of the apostles as being martyrs; namely, Peter, Paul, and James the elder. See Tertullian, *Scorpice*, cap. xv.—I am therefore led to believe, that the common reports respecting the sufferings of Christ's ambassadors were fabricated, after the days of Constantine. And two causes might lead to such reports. (1.) The extravagant estimation in which martyrdom was held made it seem necessary to rank the apostles among the martyrs.—(2.) The ambiguity of the word *μάρτυρ*, *martyr*, which properly signifies *a witness*, in which sense Christ himself called his apostles *μάρτυρες* (Acts i. 8, see also Acts ii. 32), might lead the more ignorant to believe, and to amplify these fables. Mosheim *de Rebus Christ.* &c., pp. 81—84 abridged considerably. *Tr.*

¹ [‘There is not one of the European nations that does not glory, in either an apostle, or some one of the seventy disciples, or at least in some early saint commissioned by an apostle, as having come among them and collected a Christian church. The Spaniards say, that the apostles Paul and James the elder, with many of the seventy disciples, and other assistants of the apostles, introduced the light of the gospel into their country. And a Spaniard would bring himself into trouble if he should confront this opinion. The French contend that Crescens, a disciple and companion of Paul, Dionysius the Areopagite, Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, &c., first brought their countrymen to profess Christ. Among the Italians there is scarcely a city which does not profess to have received the gospel, and its first minister from Paul or Peter. See P. Giannone, *Histoire civile du royaume de Naples*, t. i. 74, 75. And at this day a man could not escape the charge of heresy, who should raise a question on this subject. See J. Lamy, *Deliciae eruditorum*, t. viii. Pref. and t. xi. Preface. The Germans assert that Maternus, Valerianus, and many others were sent among them by the apostles; and that these legates of St. Peter, and of the other apostles, baptized respectable numbers of persons. The British think that St. Paul (as they infer from Clemens Rom. first Epistle to the Corinthians), Simon Zelotes, Aristobulus, and

especially Joseph of Arimathea, were the founders of their church. The Russians, Poles, and Prussians, honour St. Andrew as the founder of their churches. All this, and much more, passed for sober truth, so long as sacred and human learning lay buried in shades and darkness. But at this day, the most learned and wise admit, that most of these stories were fabricated after the age of Charlemagne, by men unlearned, or crafty and eager to secure distinction to their churches. See Aug. Calmet's *Histoire de Lorraine*, t. i. p. xxvi. Le Beuf, *Diss. sur l'Histoire de France*, i. 192, &c. Jo. Launoi, *Diss. qua locus Sulpitii Severi de primis Gallia martyribus, defenditur*, Opp. t. ii. pt. i. p. 184.—I commend these writers; yet cannot agree with them in dating the commencement of this foolish zeal for the antiquity of their churches, after the days of Charlemagne. It began much earlier. See Gregory Turon. *de Gloria martyrum*, cap. xii. p. 735. Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ.* &c. pp. 84—86. It must not be inferred from what Mosheim says of the foolish pretensions of the modern European nations to a high Christian antiquity, that we are to reject all that the ancient fathers relate, concerning the labours of the apostles after Christ's ascension. Mosheim was too judicious to do this. He says, *ubi supra*, pp. 80, 81: ‘As to what we are told respecting the transactions of the apostles, their travels, miracles, and death, if we except what is gathered from the New Test. and a few other ancient monuments, a large part is dubious and uncertain. Some things, however, have more credibility and verisimilitude than others. I would not reject all that is clearly attested by Origen, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, Paulinus, Jerome, Socrates, and some more ancient writers quoted by Eusebius; but what is attested only by authors subsequent to these, or unknown, I would not readily believe, unless facts offer themselves to corroborate the testimony.’ Following these judicious rules, we may believe that Peter, after preaching long in Judea, and other parts of Syria, probably visited Babylon, Asia Minor, and finally Rome, where he was crucified.—Paul's history is given in the Acts to about A.D. 64. He was probably released from captivity, visited Judea, Asia Minor, and Greece, and returning to Rome was there beheaded about A.D. 67 or 68. John remained many years in Judea, and afterwards removed to Ephesus, where he lived to a very advanced

great part of these fables came forward after the age of *Charles the Great*; when most of the Christian churches contended as vehemently, about the antiquity of their respective origins, as ever did in former days the Arcadians, Egyptians, Greeks, and other nations.

§ 7. Many who were unwilling to adopt entirely the religion of Christ, were induced, nevertheless, by the fame of his deeds, and the sublime purity of his doctrines, to rank him among men of the highest excellence, and even among the gods; as appears from numerous documents. With great veneration, many kept figures of Christ and of his apostles in their houses.¹ The Emperor Tiberius has the credit of desiring to enrol Christ among the gods of Rome, but to have been unable, because he was resisted by the senate.² Although many, at the present day, think this improbable, there are, nevertheless, weighty reasons which lead no common men to a different opinion.³

age, dying about A.D. 100. He was banished to Patmos about A.D. 95, and was greatly revered. James the elder (brother of John) was put to death by Herod Agrippa about A.D. 44 (Acts xii. 1). James the younger, the son of Alphæus, spent his life in Judea, long presided over the church of Jerusalem, and there suffered martyrdom, a little before the destruction of Jerusalem. Andrew probably laboured on the shores of the Black Sea, near the modern Constantinople, and perhaps in Greece. Philip, either the apostle or the evangelist, is reported to have ended his days at Hierapolis, in Phrygia. Thomas seems to have travelled eastward, to Parthia, Media, Persia, and India. Bartholomew took, perhaps, a more southern course, and preached in Arabia. Matthew is also reported to have travelled east, in the modern Persia. Of Simon the Canaanite nothing to be relied on can be said. Thaddeus, Lebbeus, or Jude the brother of James, the author of an epistle, is reported to have preached at Edessa, in the north of Syria. Of the companions of the apostles, Timothy, after accompanying Paul many years, is said to have been stationed at Ephesus, where he suffered martyrdom under Domitian or Nerva. Titus, another companion of Paul, is reported to have been stationed in Crete, where he died. Mark, or John surnamed Mark, attended Paul, and afterwards Peter, and probably preached the gospel in Egypt. Of Luke, little can be said, except that he accompanied Paul, and wrote his history, viz. the book of Acts, and a Gospel. Of Barnabas, nothing can be said worth relating, except what is learned from the New Testament. See J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, &c. ch. v. pp. 95—115. *Tr.*]

[The late Dr. Burton thought St. Paul's death referrible to some period between

the years 64 and 66, inclusively, probably 66, the 13th of Nero. From his conversion to his death, 35 years seem to have elapsed. *An Attempt to ascertain the Chronology of the Acts of the Apostles and of St. Paul's Epistles*, Oxford, 1830, p. 104. S.]

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 18. Irenæus, *Hæres.* i. 25, p. 105, edit. Massuet.

² [‘Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen christianum in seculum introivit, annuntiata sibi ex Syria Palestina, quæ illic veritatem illius divinitatis revelaverant, detulit ad senatum cum prærogativa suffragii sui. Senatus, quia non ipse probaverat, respuit. Cæsar in sententia mansit, comminatus periculum accusatoribus christianorum.’ (Tertull. *Apol.* c. 5). In this passage Pearson would read, *quia non in se probaverat*, for *quia non ipse probaverat*, and interpret the sentence thus: *the senate rejected the proposal, because Tiberius had not approved a similar proposal in his own case—had himself refused to be deified.* Lardner contends that this must be the meaning, even if *ipse* is retained. But a sentence which precedes, *Vetus erat decretum, ne qui Deus ab imperatore consecraretur, nisi a senatu probatus*, shows that *ipse* refers to *senatus*: *the senate refused, because it had not itself approved the proposal*; and so the passage was translated in the Greek version used by Eusebius. In a subsequent passage, Tertullian states, that the account of those supernatural events which proved the divinity of Christ, was sent to Tiberius by Pilate, who was in his conscience a Christian, and adds an expression which implies that worldly considerations alone prevented Tiberius from believing in Christ. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 110. S.]

³ [Of the favourable disposition of the Roman emperors towards Christianity, there is a noticeable testimony in the Apology of Melito of Sardis addressed to Marcus

§ 8. The causes must have been divine, which enabled men — destitute of all human aid, poor, friendless, neither eloquent, nor learned, fishermen, publicans, and moreover Jews, that is, persons odious to all other nations — in so short a time, to persuade a great part of mankind to abandon the religions of their fathers, and to embrace a new religion, which is opposed to the natural dispositions of men. Their very words in fact acted on the mind with a force that could scarcely be believed, and that could come only from above. To it were added prodigies and miracles, a prophetic declaration of things to come, the discovery of hidden counsels, loftiness of mind in the greatest emergencies, contempt for all the objects of ordinary ambition, a patient, cheerful endurance of sufferings worse than death, as well as of death itself, and finally, lives without a single spot. Among the things that men believe most firmly, no one is more unquestionable than that Jesus Christ's ambassadors had all these qualifications, and in abundance. Imagine these holy men without such endowments, and no probable reason can be given for the rapid propagation of Christianity by a band so small and feeble.

§ 9. To all this must be added the ability which these ambassadors of God possessed, of transferring the power of working miracles to their disciples. Many had, accordingly, no sooner been baptized, according to Christ's injunction, and consecrated to God by the imposition of hands and prayer, than they expressed at once their thoughts in foreign languages which they had never learned, foretold future events, healed the sick by pronouncing the name of Jesus, called even the dead back to life, and effected other things above human

Antoninus, which is preserved by Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 26. Melito here informs the emperor that his predecessors not only tolerated Christianity among the other religions, but also honoured it: *ἦν καὶ οἱ πρόγονοι σοῦ πρὸς ταῖς ἄλλαις θρησκείαις ἐτίμησαν*, which sect your progenitors treated with equal respect as the other religions. He adds, that Nero and Domitian were the only emperors who allowed the counsels of certain adversaries to influence them to make Christianity a criminal thing. If what Melito here says of Nero be true, namely, that he was influenced by the counsels of malevolent persons, to persecute the Christians, then there may be some foundation for what John of Antioch says, in *Excerptis Valesianis*, p. 808, &c., that Nero was favourable to the Christians, and to Christ, in the beginning of his reign. — Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. v. p. 57, ed. Havercamp., speaks of Tiberius's desire to have Christ enrolled among the gods, as of a thing universally known. Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 2), Orosius (*Chron. Pasch.* vii. 4), and others, afterwards repeat the story, relying chiefly on the authority of Tertullian. See Fr. Baldwin, *Comment. ad Edicta Veterum Principum Romanorum de Christianis*, pp.

22, 23, and J.^a A. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, §c. p. 221. But very learned men, in this age, have deemed this wholly incredible, and not at all compatible with the character of Tiberius, and with the state of the empire at that time. In what manner men, equally learned and ingenious, have repelled their arguments, may be seen in the Essay of Theod. Haseus, *De decreto Tiberii, quo Christum referre voluit in numerum deorum*, Erfurt. 1715, 4to, and in the French letter of J. C. Iselius, on this subject, in the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, xxxii. 147; and xxxiii. 12. — Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ.* §c. p. 92, &c. — See also Altmann, *Disquisitio historico-critica de Epistola Pilati ad Tiberium*, §c. Bern, 1755, 8vo. In this Essay, Professor Altmann maintains, (1) That Pilate was actually informed of the resurrection by the guard. (2) That he did really send to Tiberius an account of the death and resurrection of Jesus, though not such an account as the one now extant. (3) That Tiberius actually proposed in the senate that Jesus should be honoured as a god. This subject is also examined by Dr. Lardner, *Collection of Jewish and Heathen testimonies*, iii. 599, &c. ed. Lond. 1815. 4to. Tr.]

power.¹ What, and how great must have individuals appeared, who could invest others with such faculties as these!

§ 10. Such as tax imagination for other causes of this sudden revolution among men, tell us dreams which will please none who know the world. Some conjecture that the kindness of Christians to the poor induced a multitude of idle and vicious persons to embrace their faith. But it is forgotten here that Christianity could not be professed without incurring an immediate risk of life; as also that Christians did not suffer in their body the vicious, useless, and idle.² Equally groundless is the representation of others, that the profligate and flagitious lives of the pagan priests caused many to turn Christians. The profligacy of their priests might, indeed, breed contempt of the ancient religions, but it would not infuse the love of a faith which put life, credit, and property to the hazard. The man must be beside himself who could reason thus: 'The priests of the religion which I learnt from tender years lead wicked lives: I shall, therefore, go over to a body that people despise and the law condemns, although neither life nor fortune will any more be safe.'³

¹ See, among others, Tob. Pfanner, *de Charismatibus, sive donis miraculosis antiquæ ecclesiæ*, Francof. 1683. 12mo.

² 2 Thess. iii. 6—12.

³ ['Others have supposed, that the virtues of the apostles and their early followers—their sobriety, their contempt of wealth, their fortitude, their patience, &c.—induced multitudes to put themselves under their religious guidance. Integrity and virtue certainly have influence on the mind of the beholder; nor would I deny, that the holy lives of the apostles produced some effect. But we know, if we are acquainted with ourselves and with human nature, that purity of morals, and integrity of life, though they create respect and reverence, rarely produce imitation, and never, if manifest disgrace and danger will follow that imitation. We know that virtue, and even the most perfect virtue, awakens entire disgust, when it requires men to forsake the institutions and sentiments of their ancestors, and to abandon their chosen enjoyments. This is confirmed by the example of those very apostles who are said to have converted the world by the purity of their characters; nay, by the example of the Lord of those apostles, who was the most perfect pattern of virtue. I can believe that the blameless lives of the apostles induced individuals, among all nations, not to lay violent hands on them, or to show them any abuse; but to believe that they, merely by their strict morals, and their disregard for the common objects of human attachment, induced many thousands to recognise as the Saviour of the world, a person whom the Jews had caused to be crucified; to follow their own example, and

to suffer death, rather than renounce these principles; this, I say, no one can persuade me to believe. And, not to protract these remarks, whence, and by what means, did the apostles themselves acquire that admirable virtue and sanctity, which alone was able to produce in others an invincible determination to fly to Christ, and to cleave to him as the only anchor of their salvation?'—'Others, following the example of Celsus, Julian, Porphyry, and other ancient enemies of Christianity, bid us consider, that the churches gathered by the apostles, were composed of plebeian characters, servants, labourers in the fields and workshops, and women; that is, of persons deficient in intelligence, rank, and wealth, who might easily be persuaded to believe almost any thing by persons of but moderate talents. But this, which is here so confidently asserted, in the first place, was not altogether true. For the Scriptures inform us, that, among those converted to Christianity by the apostles, many were affluent, well informed, and of respectable rank. That there were persons of wealth, see 1 Tim. ii. 9, and 1 Peter iii. 3. That there were men of learning and knowledge of philosophy, see 1 Tim. vi. 20, Col. ii. 8. And that there were some though not many, noble, see 1 Cor. i. 26. The names of illustrious persons who embraced Christ in the earliest ages of the church, are collected by D. Blondell, *de Episcopis et Presbyteris*, p. 235, and by J. R. Wetstein, *Prefatio ad Originis Dial. contra Marcion.* p. 13.—Secondly, those who are not ignorant of the world, know that persons in the lower walks of life, not only value themselves, their lives and their enjoyments, as much as

CHAPTER V.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Persecutions of the Christians by Jews in Palestine—§ 2. By Jews out of Palestine—§ 3. Divine judgments on the Jews—§ 4. Ten persecutions by the pagans—§ 5. Laws against the Christians—§ 6. Causes of hostility to them. Charged with hatred to mankind—§ 7. Other causes of persecution—§ 8. Slanders against Christians—§ 9. Modes of trial and punishment—§ 10. The martyrs and confessors—§ 11. Number of them—§ 12. Acts of the martyrs—§ 13. Persecution by Nero—§ 14. Its extent—§ 15. Persecution under Domitian.

§ 1. ALTHOUGH those whom *Christ* had left as witnesses of his proceedings among men, were most conspicuous for holiness of doctrines and precepts, equally so too for innocence of life, yet the leading men and priests of the Jewish nation, not only poured upon them and their disciples the heaviest injuries and insults, but also inflicted capital punishments upon as many of them as they could. This appears from the martyrdoms of *Stephen*, of *James* the son of Zebedee, and of *James the Just*, bishop of the church of Jerusalem.¹ The true cause of this hostility, no one doubts to have been an angry feeling in the priests and doctors, who feared the ruin of their interests, if Christianity maintained its ground.

§ 2. Those Jews who lived out of Palestine, in the Roman provinces, had no greater humanity for the innocent disciples of *Christ*. It appears from the Acts of the Apostles, and from other credible records, that they spared no pains to instigate the magistrates and the populace to destroy the Christians. To this madness they were excited by the high priest and the elders of the Jews, living in Palestine; who, as we are informed, sent messengers to the foreign Jews, exhorting them not only to shun the Christians, but also to persecute them most acrimoniously.² They sought a seemly cloak for this wicked system, by denouncing the Christians, as people hostile to

others do, but they much more ardently embrace, and cling to the customs, opinions, and religion of their ancestors, than men of genius and influence, the opulent and persons of rank.—Ignorance and timidity produce and nourish superstition. Hence the more ignorant and timid a person is, a stronger hold has superstition of his mind. So that it is an easier thing to eradicate superstition from the minds of ten men, than of one woman, from a hundred well-informed and ingenuous minds, than from ten ignorant, stupid ones. Villany no where reigns more than in servants and persons of abject condition. It would be

easier, therefore, to purge from iniquity a multitude of the ingenuous and well born, than even a small number of slaves. Hence, those who make the churches, gathered by the apostles of Christ, to have been composed of persons of no respectability or rank, of slaves, women, and the illiterate, in my judgment, increase, rather than diminish the glory achieved by those inspired men.' Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* pp. 90—92.]

¹ Acts vii. 55; xii. 1, 2. Joseph, *Antiq. Jud.* xx. 8. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23.

² See Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryphone*, pp. 51—53, 109, 138, 318.

the majesty of Rome, a malefactor, most justly slain by *Pilate*, being called by them their king. Such was the transmission of this madness from father to son, through successive generations, that the Christians had henceforth no enemies more bitter than the Jews.¹

§ 3. But God himself exacted from this perfidious nation the severest punishments for so many crimes committed against Jesus and his friends. For he suffered Jerusalem, the capital of Palestine, together with the temple, to be rased to their foundations, by the Roman emperor *Vespasian*, and his son *Titus*, about forty years after *Christ's* ascension; an innumerable multitude of the people being miserably butchered, and most of the survivors being consigned to the hardships of slavery. The whole series of transactions, than which perhaps one more sad never happened, *Josephus*,² himself a Jew, has copiously and lucidly detailed. From this time, the Jews have encountered everywhere a great increase of popular malevolence and hatred.

§ 4. The Gentiles, who were polytheists, brought upon the Christian church still greater calamities than the Jews, whose anger wanted power. The persecutions of the Christians by the Romans have, for many ages, been accounted *ten* in number.³ But the ancient history of the church does not support precisely this number: for if we reckon only the general and more severe persecutions, they were fewer than ten; but if we include the provincial and more limited persecutions, the number will be much greater than ten. Some Christians of the fifth century were led into a belief, by certain passages of scripture, especially by one in the Apocalypse,⁴ that the Christian body was fated to undergo *ten* calamities of the heavier kind; to which opinion they then accommodated history, though against her will, not, however, all in the same way.⁵

§ 5. *Nero* first enacted laws for the extermination of Christians. *Domitian* followed his example: as did afterwards *Marcus Antoninus* the philosopher, *Severus*, and other emperors, who were hostile to the Christians. Their decrees, however, were not all equally severe, nor all founded on the same causes. A celebrated lawyer, of the name of *Domitius*, anciently collected all the imperial laws against the Christians, in his treatise *de Officio Proconsulis*; ⁶ which, if it were

¹ [Passages from early Christian writers, who complain of the Jewish persecutions, are collected by J. A. Fabricius, *Lux. Evang. &c.* ch. vi. § 1, p. 121. See also the Epist. of the church of Smyrna, *de Martyrio Polycarpi*, §§ xii. xiii. *Schl.*]

² In his History of the Jewish War. [Cf. Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, t. i. c. 17. *Schl.*]

³ The writers on these persecutions are enumerated by J. A. Fabricius, *Lux. Evang. &c.* cap. vii. p. 133, &c.

⁴ Ch. xvii. 12—14.

⁵ See Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, ii. 33, p. 387, ed. Horn. Augustinus, *de Civit. Dei*, xviii. 52. [In the fourth cen-

tury, the number of the persecutions had not been defined. Lactantius, *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, reckons up only *six*. Eusebius, *H. E.*, does not state their number; yet we might make out *nine* from this writer. This is the number given by Sulpitius Severus, in the fifth century. But in his times originated the opinion of just *ten* persecutions; and Sulpitius, to make out that number, includes the persecution of Antichrist in the end of the world. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 98, &c. *Schl.*—Dr. Hey considers that eleven persecutions may be made out from Eusebius. *Lectures in Divinity*, Camb., 1841, i. 201. S.]

⁶ See Lactantius, *Instit. Divin.* v. 11.

now extant, would doubtless throw much light on the history of the church under the pagan emperors. Now, many things are left wholly to conjecture.

§ 6. As the Romans did not trouble people on account of religion, and allowed even the Jews to live according to their own laws, it is not unreasonably asked, what could have caused all their severity to the Christians, whose religion, most holy in itself, was conducive to the people's welfare, both publicly and privately? The *first* cause of this cruelty, I conceive to be, because the Christians contemned and abhorred the public religion of the state, which was most closely connected and bound up with the forms of Roman polity. For though the Romans tolerated all religions from which the commonwealth had nothing to fear, yet they would not suffer the sacred rites of their ancestors, as established by the laws, to be derided, and the people withdrawn from them. Both these things, however, the Christians dared to do. Nor did they assail only the Roman religion, but likewise that professed by every other nation. Hence the Romans concluded, that the Christian sect, besides its extreme arrogance, had an unfriendliness to the public peace and tranquillity, which threatened civil wars. This, if I do not mistake, is that *hatred of the human race*, with which Tacitus taxes the Christians; nor do I think that any other reason induced him to call the Christian religion a *pestilent superstition*, or Suetonius to brand it as *malignant*.¹

§ 7. Another cause, of very great weight, was the striking dissimilarity of Christian worship to that of all other religions. Among Christians were no victims, no temples, no statues, no oracles, no orders of priests.² These things a religious body could not want, without being commonly considered by ignorant people as destitute of all religion. Such, however, as apparently denied the gods, or God altogether, were even by the Roman laws accounted pests of the human race. Besides, the worship of so many deities found good livings for a countless throng of priests, augurs, soothsayers, dealers, and artizans. As all these apprehended want, if Christ's religion

What remain of these laws are illustrated by Fran. Baldwin, *Comment. ad edicta veter. princip. Romanor. de Christianis*; republished by N. H. Gundling, with Baldwin's *Constantinus Magnus*, Halle, 1727, 8vo.

¹ [Tacitus says that the Christians cruelly and madly charged with the crime of burning Rome under Nero, *haud perinde in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis, convicti sunt*. (*Annal.* xv. 44.) He had before, in the same chapter, characterised their religion, as *exitiabilis superstitio*. Suetonius (*Nero*, 16) says, *Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ*. *S.*] Because such as could not endure the sacred rites and the religion of the Romans, nor those of all the world, seemed to be the

foes of mankind, and to indulge hatred towards all nations.

² [The primitive Christians undoubtedly had no order among them designated as the *priesthood*, in the New Testament. But reasonings built upon this fact have sometimes gone too far. The *presbyters* of the apostolic epistles, may fairly be considered as representatives, in some respects, of the Mosaic priests, although the sacrificial duties of these latter, which were their great distinction, are, in strict accuracy, no more. Even this, however, some Christians are unwilling to admit, maintaining a proper, material sacrifice in the eucharist, and hence claiming a character strictly sacerdotal, for those who have authority to administer that sacrament. *S.*]

should gain the upper hand, they rose up against it with united strength, and wished to exterminate its followers.¹

§ 8. They, whose interest it was to arrest the progress of Christianity, in order to effect their object the sooner, disseminated among the vulgar the basest calumnies against every thing Christian; to which the populace, generally over fickle and credulous, gave assent. These injuries and calumnies may be learnt from those writers who defended Christianity, in the first ages.² The same persons cunningly persuaded the multitude, that all the calamities, wars, tempests, and diseases, that afflicted mankind, were sent upon them by the angry gods, because the Christians, who contemned their authority, were everywhere tolerated.³ Other less weighty causes are here omitted.

§ 9. The various kinds of punishment, both capital and corrective, inflicted upon those who venerated *Christ*, are described by learned men, in works professedly on that subject.⁴ The manner of proceeding before the tribunals may be seen in the *Acts of the Martyrs*, in the letters which passed between *Pliny* and *Trajan*, and in other ancient documents.⁵ But it is clear, that the mode of proceeding in the courts was not always the same. For the laws of the emperors, by which the magistrates were to be guided, differed importantly at different periods. Thus, at one time, the Christians were carefully sought after; at another, the judges waited till some one came forward to accuse them. Sometimes the confessing or convicted Christians were hurried forthwith to execution, if they did not renounce their religion: at other times, the magistrates laboured, by various species of torture and cruelty, to induce them to apostatise.

§ 10. Those who fell in these perilous days of the church under punishments of various kinds, were called *Martyrs*; a term borrowed from the sacred writings, and denoting that they were *witnesses* for *Christ*. Those who risked life in professing *Christ* before the magistrates, or for his sake incurred the loss of health, or goods, or honours, were denominated *confessors*. Both obtained immense veneration and influence among the Christians; which gave them prerogatives and honours, altogether peculiar and extraordinary; such, indeed, as might furnish matter for a volume that would be useful in various respects. These prerogatives were undoubtedly conferred to make others more readily encounter evils of every kind

¹ See the account of Demetrius the silversmith, *Acts* xix. 25. *Pliny*, *Epist.* lib. x. ep. 97. 'The temples, which were almost deserted, begin to be frequented again; and the sacred rites, which had been long neglected, are again performed.—The victims which hitherto had found almost no purchasers, begin to come again to the market,' &c.

² This subject is nearly exhausted by Chr. Kortholt, *Paganus Obtrektor, seu de Calumniis gentiliū in Christianos*, in three books, Kilon. 1698, 4to. To which add

J. J. Huldreich, *de Calumniis gentiliū in Christianos*, Tiguri, 1744, 8vo.

³ See Arnobius, *adversus Gentes* [and Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. 40. *Schl.*]

⁴ Anton. Gallonius and Casp. Sagittarius, *de Cruciatibus Martyrum*; the latter printed at Jena, 1673, 4to; the best edition of the former is Antw. 1668, 12mo. [Both contain mixtures of the doubtful with the true: for the *Acta Martyrum*, now extant, cannot be relied on. Mosheim, *de Reb. Chr. &c.*]

⁵ See J. H. Boehmer, *Jus Eccles. Protest.* tom. iv. lib. v. Decretal. tit. i. § 32.

for Christ's sake.¹ But as all peculiar privileges, by the fault of men, have a tendency to degenerate into sources of evil, so these too, not unfrequently, were improperly used: they found likewise food for superstition and other evils.

§ 11. That a great number of persons of every kind and condition suffered death for the sake of *Christ*, during the first three or four centuries, no impartial person acquainted with those times can entertain a doubt. But, since *Henry Dodwell* ventured upon shaking this ancient opinion,² there have been many who maintain with him, that only a *few* actually suffered death on account of the Christian religion; others, however, vehemently oppose this view as a reflexion on assistance from above. Those who take the middle path between these two extremes, will probably come nearest to the truth. The *martyrs* were not so numerous as they were anciently supposed to be, and as some still account them; but they were more numerous than *Dodwell* and his friends suppose them. Into this opinion, I think, they will the more readily come, who may observe that ancient books do not represent all Christians whatsoever as promiscuously harassed and put upon their trials, even in the church's most arduous times. Persons in the humbler conditions of life were generally more safe; while greater danger impended over the rich (whose wealth had charms for the judges), over the learned, also the doctors and heads of churches, lastly, over such as were talented and eloquent.³

§ 12. The words and actions of the martyrs, from the time of their arrest till their last moments, were carefully committed to writing, with a view of reading them on certain days as models to posterity. But only a few of these *Acta Martyrum* have reached us;⁴ much the greater part of them having been committed to the flames, during the ten years' war of *Diocletian* against the Christians, when imperial orders required all the books and papers of Christians to be collected and burned. From the eighth century, indeed, both Greeks and Latins have used much diligence in compiling lives of the ancient martyrs; that most of them relate fables coloured with an infusion of rhetoric, is admitted by the sounder heads even in the Roman church. Nor is more credit due to those catalogues of saints,

¹ [This seems too philosophical an account of this matter. The early Christians did not, thus coldly, calculate distant consequences and effects, in order to determine what place in their affections, and what rank in the church, they should give to their brethren and pastors who suffered and died for their religion. Nature, religion, and all the ties which united them to Christ, to the church, and to one another, combined to render these holy men and consistent Christians venerable and lovely in their eyes; and of course to procure them a rank and privileges in the church altogether peculiar. Whoever reads the most authentic accounts of the ancient martyrs, of Polycarp, for in-

stance, will see abundant evidence of the operation of these causes; but nothing of that calculating policy of which Mosheim speaks. *Tr.*]

² In his noted dissertation, *de Paucitate Martyrum*, which is the eleventh among his *Dissertt. Cyprianicæ*.

³ [See *Martyrium Polycarpi*, § 12. *Acta Fructuosi*, in Ruinart's *Acta Martyr. sincera*, p. 219. Cyprian, *Epistt.* v. and xiv. pp. 10 and 23, ed. Benedict. and many others. Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* § c. p. 106. *Tr.*]

⁴ Such of them as are not wholly unworthy of credit were collected in a moderate sized folio, by Theod. Ruinart, *Selecta et sincera Martyrum Acta*, Amstelod. 1713.

called *Martyrologies*, which have either been compiled by ignorant and incompetent men, or since much falsified. Hence this part of ecclesiastical history enjoys very little light.

§ 13. Nero was the first emperor that persecuted the Christians; and his cruelty was extreme. He accused those innocent people of a crime which he himself had committed; namely, that of setting fire to the city of Rome.¹ To make, therefore, punishment correspond with crime, he caused many of them to illumine the streets of his capital, at night, by enveloping their bodies in a mass of fire.² Others he slew in various other ways. This persecution began in the middle of November A.D. 64. In it, the ancients tell us, *Paul* and *Peter* suffered death at Rome: but many cannot bring themselves to believe this, because of its repugnance to chronology.³ This persecution

¹ See the two French dissertations of Alph. de Vignoles, on the cause and the commencement of Nero's persecution; in Phil. Masson's *Histoire critique de la République des Lettres*, viii. 74—117, and ix. 172—186. See also Toinard on Lactantius *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, p. 398.

² ['Et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis contexti, laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus affixi, aut flammandi, atque ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis uterentur.' (Tacit. *Annal.* xv. 44.) This last refinement of wanton cruelty was perpetrated by inclosing the miserable victim, kept upright by a stake, under his chin, in a vest smeared with combustible substances, and setting fire to it. Juvenal is thought to glance at Nero's fiend-like play in this instance, in the well-known lines,

'Pone Tigellinum, tæda lucebis in illa,
Qua stantes ardent, qui fixo gutture
fumant.'

Sat. i. 155.

Gifford thus renders these lines —

—'But glance at Tigellinus, and you shine,
Chain'd to a stake, in pitchy robes, and
light,
Lugubrious torch, the deepening shades
of night.'

In a note he adds, 'The dreadful conflagration which laid waste great part of Rome in the reign of Nero, was found to have broken out in the house of Tigellinus. As his intimacy with the emperor was no secret, it strengthened the general belief, that the city was burned by design. Nothing seems to have enraged Nero so much as this discovery, and to avert the odium from his favourite, he basely taxed the Christians with setting fire to his house.' *S.*]

³ Tillemont, *Histoire des Empereurs*, i. 564, &c. and Baratier, *de Successione Romanorum. Pontif.* cap. v. p. 60. [All agree that both these apostles, Paul and Peter,

were put to death in the reign of Nero: but as to the year and place, there is controversy. Many question whether *both* suffered at the same time. They believe, according to the testimony of Prudentius (*Peristephan. de passione beator. Apostolor. Petri et Pauli*, vv. 5, 6), that Peter suffered one year earlier than Paul; but on the same day. As to the day on which Paul suffered, some make it the 29th of June; and others, the 23rd of February. The year is, by some, determined to A.D. 64, so von Henschen, *Acta Sanctor.* April. i. D. Papebroch, *Propylæum ad Acta S. May. Anton. Pagi, Critica in Annal. Baron.* i. 51, 52.; [Pagi is decided for A.D. 65], by others, A.D. 65, and again by others A.D. 67, so Baumgarten; and lastly by others, A.D. 68, so John Pearson, *Annales Paulini*, p. 25, which is the most probable opinion. The day when both apostles suffered, was probably the 22nd of February. That Paul was beheaded during Nero's persecution, is supported by the testimony of Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 25, and of Lactantius, *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. ii. p. 1375, ed. Büneman. As to the place, an obscure writer, Ulr. Valenus, in a book *Quo Petrus Romam non venisse demonstratur*, 1660, 4to, p. 40, denies that either apostle suffered at Rome, and endeavours to prove, that their martyrdom was at Jerusalem: which also Bale maintains in regard to Peter, *Centur. Scriptur. Britan.* p. 16. This opinion is confuted by various writers, who are mentioned in Walch's *Biblioth. theol. selecta*, iii. 458. On this whole subject, consult W. Cave, *Life of Paul*, c. vii. § 9, p. 424, of his *Antiq. Apostol.* Tillemont, *Mém. pour servir à l'histoire de l'église*, t. i. pt. ii. note 42, p. 768, and Fabricius, *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* pt. i. p. 450. On the fabulous circumstances related of Paul's martyrdom, see J. G. Walch's *Hist. Eccles. N. T.* p. 277. *Schl.*—On the chronology of Paul's life and labours, see Witsii *Melctemata Leidenisia*, 1703, 4to.

terminated at the death of Nero, who is well known to have been his own executioner, A. D. 68. For about *four years*, therefore, the Christians³ suffered every species of cruelty at his hands.

§ 14. How *far* the persecution under *Nero* extended, is not agreed among the learned. For, while the greater number suppose it to have spread over the whole Roman *empire*, there are not wanting others who bound it by the limits of the capital. The former opinion, which is the ancient one,¹ appearing the better supported, we have no hesitation in agreeing with such as think that public laws were enacted against the whole body of Christians, and sent moreover into the provinces. To this opinion we are led, among other reasons, by the authority of *Tertullian*, who clearly intimates that *Nero* and *Domitian* enacted laws against the Christians which *Trajan* so much mitigated as to render them inoperative.² The noted Spanish or Portuguese *inscription*, in which *Nero* is commended for having purged the province of the *new superstition*, being suspected by the Spaniards themselves, I am unwilling to accept as evidence.³ The Christians moreover were condemned rather as incendiaries, than on religious grounds.⁴ But who can suppose that a sect, which the emperor charged with so great an enormity, was tolerated by him patiently out of Rome?⁵

Pearson, *Annales Paul.*, the Introductions to the N. T. by Eichhorn, Bertholt, Horne, &c. and other works referred to in Winer's *Biblisches Realw. art. Paul. Tr.*]

¹ The first who rejected the common opinion, so far as I know, was Fran. Baldwin [an eminent civilian of Paris, who died A. D. 1573], in his *Comment. ad edicta Imperator. in Christianos*, pp. 27, 28. After him, Jo. Launoi, in *Diss. qua Sulpitii Severi locus de prima martyrum Gallie epocha vindicatur*, § 1, pp. 139, 140, tom. ii. pt. i. of his works. Still more learned, and on the same side, was Henry Dodwell, Diss. xi. in his *Dissertt. Cyprianicæ*, § xiii. p. 59, whom many others have followed: [as Jo. le Clerc, *Hist. Eccles. N. T. Cent. i. p. 428*, Joach. Lange, *Hist. Eccles. p. 360*. Nicol. Gurtler, *Syst. theol. prophet. p. 491*. Baumgarten, *Auszug der Kirchengesch. i. 376* (who supposes the persecution extended only so far as the power of the Prætorian Præfect). D. Semler, *Sel. Capita Hist. Eccles. i. 24*. (Also J. E. C. Schmidt, *Handbuch der christl. Kirchengesch. i. 120*, and A. Neander, *Allgem. Gesch. d. christl. Kirch. vol. i. pt. i. p. 137. Tr.*)] — The arguments for both opinions are stated in J. G. Walch, *Hist. Eccles. p. 548*, who thinks the question to be altogether doubtful. Jablonsky was of the same sentiment, *Institutt. Historiæ Christ. antiq. p. 40. Schl.*]

² *Tertullian, Apologet. cap. iv. p. 46*, edit. Havercamp.

³ This *inscription* may be seen in J. Gruterus, *Inscriptionum t. i. p. cxxxviii.*

n. 9. [It is this: 'Neroni, ob provinciam latronibus et his qui novam generi humano superstitionem inculcabant, purgatam.' *Tr.*] But the best Spanish writers do not venture to defend the authority of this inscription; because it has not been seen by any one; and Cyriac of Ancona, who first produced it, is acknowledged by all to be unworthy of credit. I will subjoin the decision of that excellent and judicious historian of Spain, Jo. de Ferreras, *Histoire générale d'Espagne*, i. 192 — 'I cannot refrain from remarking, that Cyriac of Ancona was the first that published the inscription, and that from him all others had derived it. But as the credibility of this writer is suspected in the judgment of all the learned, and as not a vestige nor any recollection of this inscription remains, in the places where it is said to have been found, and no one knows now where to find it; every one may form such opinion of it as he pleases.'

⁴ See Theod. Ruinart, *Præf. ad Acta Martyrum sincera et selecta*, p. xxxi. &c.

⁵ [Nearly all the facts relating to this persecution, except the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, we owe to Tacitus. *Annals*, lib. xv. c. 44. After describing the conflagration, which utterly consumed *three* of the fourteen wards, and spread ruin in *seven* others, and the efforts of Nero to soothe the indignant and miserable citizens, he says, 'But no human aid, no munificence of the prince, nor expiations of the gods, removed from him the infamy of having ordered the conflagration. Therefore, to stop the clamour,

§ 15. *Nero* being dead, the fury of this first war against the Christians ceased. But in the year 93 or 94,¹ a new assault was made upon them by *Domitian*, an emperor little behind *Nero* in flagitious acts.² The cause of the persecution, if we may credit *Hegesippus*, was fear of losing the throne: for the emperor had heard, some way or other, that a man would arise from among the relatives of *Christ*, bent upon revolution and political disturbance.³ This persecution,

Nero falsely accused and subjected to the most exquisite punishments, a people hated for their crimes, called *Christians*. The founder of the sect, *Christ*, was executed in the reign of *Tiberius*, by the procurator *Pontius Pilate*. The pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, burst forth again; not only through *Judea*, the birth-place of the evil, but at *Rome* also, where everything atrocious and base centres and is in repute. Those first seized, confessed; then a vast multitude, detected by *their* means, were convicted, not so much of the crime of burning the city, as of hatred to mankind. And insult was added to their torments; for being clad in skins of wild beasts, they were torn to pieces by dogs; or, affixed to crosses to be burned, were used as lights, to dispel the darkness of night, when the day was gone. *Nero* devoted his gardens to the show, and held *Circensian* games, mixing with the rabble, or mounting a chariot, clad like a coachman. Hence, though the guilty and those meriting the severest punishment suffered; yet compassion was excited, because they were destroyed, not for the public good, but to satisfy the cruelty of an individual.'—It appears from this account that a vast multitude (*multitudo ingens*) suffered at *Rome*,—and suffered in a most inhuman manner;—that they were falsely accused, and by *Nero's* instigation; not because he had anything against *them*, but because they were a despised people, and he hoped to avert the public odium from *himself*. But the case was too plain; their innocence was known, and *Nero's* fiend-like merriment only raised compassion towards *them*, and increased the odium against *him*. It is clear from this account, that the Christians, in the opinion of *Tacitus*, deserved to be exterminated for their religion; yet that *Nero* did not proceed on this ground, but on the false charge of their having kindled the fires of *Rome*. *Lactantius*, then (*de Mortibus Persecutorum*, cap. ii.), erred in attributing other designs to *Nero*, namely, the extermination of the *Christian religion*. The commencement of this persecution is determined by the time of the conflagration, which *Tacitus* says (*Annals*, xv. 33, 41) began July 19, A.D. 65 (or xiv. *Kalend. Sextiles*, C. *Lecanio* et M. *Licinio Coss.*), and lasted six days. Some time after, but in the same year, the persecution

broke out. But *how long it continued*, is uncertain. If *Paul* and *Peter* suffered in the very last year of *Nero's* reign, as the fathers state (*Eusebius*, *Chronicon*; and *Jerome*, *de Viris illustr.* c. i. and v.), the persecution doubtless ceased only on *Nero's* death. But if they suffered earlier, then we have no proof of the continuance of the persecution so long.—As to the extent of the persecution, it is wholly in the dark. If we consider simply the description of it, or the causes from which it originated, and the feelings of *Nero* towards the Christians, we have no reason to suppose it extended beyond the city of *Rome* and its neighbourhood. Yet the general impression in former ages, and the belief of many in this age, make the persecution a general one. The only argument of much plausibility for this opinion is derived from a passage in *Tertullian* (*Apologet.* cap. iv. p. 46, ed. *Havercamp.*), where he speaks of the persecuting laws of the empire, as being enacted by the very vilest and most odious among the emperors, and mentions *Nero* as the first that 'drew the sword' against the Christians; and *Domitian* as the second who did so. Whence it is inferred, that *Nero*, as well as *Domitian*, must have enacted public laws against the Christians; and of course that the persecution in *Nero's* reign must have been general, or throughout the empire. But considering the fervid, rhetorical style of *Tertullian*, this seems to be a slender foundation, on which to ground a conclusion, that has no support from well-attested facts. *Tr.*]

¹ [The precise year, in which the persecution by *Domitian* began, is not certain. *Toinard* has discussed the point in his notes on *Lactantius de Mortibus Persecutorum*, cap. iii. That it raged in the year 95, is stated by *Eusebius*, *H. E.* iii. 18, but how long before this it commenced, is not clear. — *Pagi* (*Crit. Annal. Baron.* i. 85, 87) supposes it began A.D. 93. *Toinard*, ubi supra, A.D. 94, and *Dodwell* (*Diss. Cyprian.* xi. p. 71), A.D. 95. *Mosheim* (*de Reb. Christ. &c.*) says A.D. 94 or 95. *Tr.*]

² See *Theod. Ruinart, Præf. ad Acta Martyrum*, p. xxxii. [*Thom. Ittig, Selecta Hist. Eccles. capita*, sæc. i. c. 6, § 11, p. 531. *Schl.*]

³ *Eusebius*, *H. E.* iii. 19, 20. [In this simple, unvarnished story, there is nothing

undoubtedly, was severe, but the emperor's assassination soon afterwards rendered it brief.¹ The principal martyrs named are, *Flavius Clemens*, a consul, and *Flavia Domitilla*,² his niece or wife. In the midst of this persecution, *John*, the apostle, was banished to the isle of Patmos; but whether, first, after being cast into a body of oil on fire, by order of the emperor, he came out alive and unhurt, though *Tertullian* and others say so, many think uncertain.³

difficult to be believed. It is therefore credible, that some enemy of both Jews and Christians suggested to the emperor, that the Jews were expecting a king of David's line, who would give laws to the world; and that the Christians likewise believed, that Christ would reappear, and set up a splendid kingdom; that from both these classes of people, insurrections and trouble were to be feared; and that the tyrant, enraged by the suggestions of the insidious foe, ordered all the posterity of David to be sought out and to be put to death; and to prevent the Christians from making disturbance, he commanded them to be put under restraints, or to be punished with severity. Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ. &c.* p. 111.]

¹ [The termination of this persecution is stated differently by the ancients. Some say, that Domitian himself put an end to it before his death. Hegesippus (in Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 20) states that Domitian, having learned that there were Christians of the lineage of David, and kinsmen of Christ, still living in Palestine, had them brought to Rome, and interrogated them closely respecting their pedigree, their wealth, and the future kingdom of Christ; and from their answers and their whole appearance he concluded he had nothing to fear from them, and dismissed them; and thereupon, he published a decree, terminating the persecution. So likewise, Tertullian (*Apologet.* v. 60) says of Domitian, 'He receded from his attempt, and recalled those he had banished.' But Lactantius (*de Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. 3) represents his acts and edicts as repealed *after his death*, when it

was that the church recovered its former state. And Xiphilin, on Nerva (*Dion Cassius*, lxxviii. 1, abridged by Xiphilin), says, that 'Nerva recalled those banished for impiety,' i. e. the Christians. Perhaps Domitian published an edict favourable to the Christians, a little before his death, the benefits of which they began to enjoy, first, after his decease. *Schl.*]

² [See Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 18, and *Chronicon*, ann. 95. Some have supposed that the wife and niece of Clemens *both* had the same name; and that the first was banished to the island of *Pandataria*, near Italy, and the second, to another island called *Pontia*. See Tillemont, *Mém.* ii. 124, &c., and Fleury, *History of the Church*, lib. ii. § 52. *Schl.*]

³ See the amicable discussion between the Rev. Mr. Heumann and myself, in my *Syntagma Diss. ad historiam eccles. pertinentium*, i. 497–546. [Tertullian's words (*de Præscr. adv. Hæc.* c. 36) are *Apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur*. Such a brief and incidental notice of a circumstance, in itself very unlikely, by a writer who was not born until fifty years or more after its alleged occurrence, is obviously quite insufficient for establishing it. *S.* — Mosheim himself did not think that the story was to be treated with contempt; Burton, *Eccles. Hist.* Lect. xii.; and Blunt (*Hist. Chr. Ch.* p. 66) inclines to believe the fact, as being well reported in Tertullian's time, and in conformity with the promise of protection given by our Lord. *S. Luke x. 19. Ed.*]

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. The state of philosophy in the East little known — § 2. Philosophy of the Persians, Chaldeans, and Arabians — § 3. Jewish and Egyptian wisdom — § 4. The proper oriental philosophy — § 5. Its first principles — § 6. Its patrons not agreed in their opinions — § 7. Its precepts concerning God — § 8. Concerning the origin of the world — § 9. Concerning human souls — § 10. The Jewish philosophy — § 11. Grecian learning — § 12. Roman learning and philosophy — § 13. Attention to science in other nations.

§ 1. IF it were known what opinions were advanced and maintained by the men of most intelligence among the oriental nations, at the time when the Christian religion began to enlighten mankind, many things in the early history of the church might be more fully and more accurately explained. But only a few fragments of oriental philosophy, as all know, have come down to us; and those which have reached us still need a learned man to collect them all, arrange them properly, and expound them sagaciously.¹

§ 2. The prevailing system in Persia was that of the Magi, who, as is well known, placed over this universe two principles, or deities, one good, the other evil. Their followers, however, were not agreed as to the precise nature of these first principles.² Nevertheless, this doctrine spread over no small portion of Asia and Africa, particularly among the Chaldeans, Assyrians, Syrians, and Egyptians, though under modifications; nor did it leave even the Jews untinctured with its principles.³ The Arabians of that age, and long afterwards, were more remarkable for strength and courage than intellectual culture. They gained, indeed, no great credit in literature before *Mahomet*. This their own writers do not deny.⁴

¹ There is extant an English work of Thomas Stanley, on *the History of Oriental Philosophy*, which J. Le Clerc translated into Latin. But that learned man has left the field of oriental philosophy, not to be gleaned only, but to be reaped, by others. He is much inferior, both in genius and erudition, to Ja. Brucker, whose *History of Philosophy* should by all means be consulted.

² See Tho. Hyde, *Historia religionis veterum Persarum*, Oxon. 1700, 4to — a very learned work, but ill-digested, and full of improbable conjectures.

³ See Jo. Christoph. Wolf, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, Hamb. 1707, 8vo; also Mosheim, notes on Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, p. 328, 423, &c.

⁴ See Abulpharajus, *de Moribus Arabum*, p. 6, published by Pocock.

§ 3. The Indians, from very early times, were much famed for their love of profound knowledge. Of their philosophical tenets we could perhaps form an opinion at the present day, if their very ancient sacred book, which they denominate *Veda*, or *the law*, were brought to light, and translated into some one of the better known languages. The accounts given by travellers among the Indians, concerning this book, are so contradictory and fluctuating, that we must wait for further information.¹ The Egyptians were unquestionably divided into various sects, disagreeing in opinion:² wherefore they seem to labour in vain, who would reduce the philosophy of this people to one consistent system.

§ 4. But of all the philosophic systems that were received in Asia and part of Africa during our Saviour's age, no one occasioned more injury to the interests of Christianity than that which bore the name of *Gnosis*,³ that is, *the way to a true knowledge of God*, and which has been already styled by us the *Oriental*, to distinguish it from the Grecian philosophy. From this school issued the founders and leaders of those sects, which during the three first centuries occasioned most of the difficulties and uneasinesses in Christian affairs. In striving to make Christ's simple and most holy wisdom agree with the precepts of that philosophy which they had imbibed, men gave birth to various and surprising dreams, obtruding doctrines upon their followers, that were some of them ludicrous, others intricate and obscure to a strange degree. The ancient Greek and Latin fathers, who contended against these sects,

¹ I have recently learned, that this most desirable book has been obtained by some French Jesuits residing in India, and that it has been, or will be, deposited in the king of France's library. See *Lettre du P. Calmette à M. de Cartigny, dans des Lettres édifiantes et curieuses des Miss. Étrangères*, xxi. Recueil, p. 455, &c., and xxiii. Rec. p. 161. [The extensive collections of MSS. deposited in the library of the East India Company, the Bodleian, and the libraries at Berlin and Paris, have, in the last eighteen years, given a powerful impulse to the study of Sanskrit literature. The principal parts of the *Veda* have been edited, commented upon, and in part translated. The term *Veda*, in its widest acceptation, comprehends the whole circle of sacred lore, appropriated exclusively to the spiritual wants of the priestly caste. The most ancient parts of it are embodied in four large collections (*sanhita*). Of these, the *Rigveda* contains 1,028 hymns, in the majority of cases addressed to the deified powers in the sky, atmosphere, and earth; such as the bright heaven, the sun, the dawn, the Dioscuri, wind and fire. In the *Yajurveda* we find the liturgy used at the principal sacrifices; while the *Sāmaveda* is composed of sentences, selected from the *Rigveda*, for chanting at the libation of the juice of the Soma plant. The

hymns of the *Atharvaveda* were chiefly applied to superstitious purposes; such as imprecations, invocations of particular plants and amulets, and other usages of a magic and private character. To each of these four Vedas is appended a *Brāhmana*, or theological section, treating of sacrifices and their ritual accompaniments, together with legendary matter, serving to illustrate the original texts. The *Upanishads*, or philosophical disquisitions on the nature of God and the human soul, form the last part of what is properly called *Veda*, or sacred knowledge. For an accurate information on the whole subject, the reader is referred to Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, vol. i.; R. Roth, *zur Geschichte des Weda*; A. Weber, *Vorlesungen*, and more especially to M. Müller's *History of ancient Sanskrit Literature*. — For this note I am indebted to Dr. Aufrecht, Professor of Sanskrit at Edinburgh. *Ed.*]

² See Mosheim's notes on Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, i. 415.

³ [*Γνωσις*, Gr. knowledge; by way of eminence. Hence pretenders to this kind of knowledge were called *Gnostics*, or *knowing ones*. 'It was a leading tenet of Gnosticism, that the supreme God was unknown before the coming of Christ.' Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 38, note. *S.*]

found an origin for them in the principles of *Plato*; but those good men, being acquainted with no philosophy but the Grecian, and ignorant of everything oriental, were deceived by a certain relationship between some of the *Platonic* opinions, and such as were current in the east. Whoever compares the Platonic philosophy carefully with the Gnostic will readily see that they are widely different.¹

§ 5. The first principles of this philosophy seem to have been the dictates of mere reason. For the author of it undoubtedly thus argued: Many are the evils in this universe, and men are borne onwards by a sort of natural impulse to the doing of things that reason condemns. Yet that internal mind, from which all spirits have emanated, being unquestionably free from every evil quality, is infinitely good and beneficent. Hence the source of the evils with which the world abounds must be something *external* to the Deity. There is, however, nothing external to Him but matter; this, therefore, must be regarded as the seat and origin of all evil and vice. From these principles the conclusion was, that matter, like God, has existed from eternity, though not by God's will or command, but by the power and labour of some other nature, inferior to God; that it was formed, as we see it, into the world; and that the human race was not created by the supreme Deity, but by one less perfect and powerful. For who can believe, that a God infinitely good, and quite incapable of knowing vice, ever brought matter into shape, bad and vicious as its nature is, and tempered it with a portion of his own perfections? When they attempted, however, to go further, and find some way of accounting for the chance or contrivance which had so skilfully worked up that rude and malignant matter, especially for the union of bodies made from it with heavenly spirits, then reason and natural analogies forsook them. The inventive faculty was, therefore, necessarily tasked for some fabulous mode of accounting for the world, and the origin of mankind.

§ 6. But as those who undertake to explain things obscure and difficult by means of mere conjecture can very seldom agree, so those who attempted to solve this difficulty split into various sects. Some

¹ [This account of an *oriental philosophy*, the parent of Gnosticism, is, as Dr. Murdock saw, not an historical description of an actual system, but an abstract idea formed by combining and systematising the tenets common to the Gnostic schools, and eliminating their differences. Mosheim's words imply that he believed in the existence of such a school; but he appears (*Comm. de Rebus*, §c. 19—21, and *Diss. de causis suppositorum librorum inter Christianos sæc. primi et secundi*, §c. 3—6) to have confessed that he has little evidence, except the necessity of the supposition, in his favour. Murdock traces Gnosticism, in common with the Jewish Cabbala, to (1) the oriental tendency to substitute contemplation or speculation for ratiocination, in the search for truth; and (2) to the inclination

common to the early Greek cosmogonical speculations as well, to substitute a *physical* for an *intelligent* cause of creation. He quotes Tittmann (*Tractatus de vestigiis Gnosticoorum in N. T. frustra quæsitis*, Lips. 1773) to show that Gnosticism was unknown in the first century; and Lewald *Comm. ad hist. &c. de doctrina Gnostica*, Heidelb. 1818) to prove that it is materially different from any known ancient system. Cf. Neander, *Allgem. Gesch. d. Chr. Relig.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 627.—The fathers traced it to Platonism; Lewald to the Zend system; J. J. Schmidt to Buddhism; Möhler thinks that it proceeded directly and entirely from an exaggerated principle of practical Christianity, viz. contempt of the world, seeking a speculative basis in an eclectic application of the old systems. Gieseler, i. 135. *Ed.*]

conceived that there must be *two eternal first principles*, the one presiding over *light*, the other over *matter*; and by the contests between these principles, they accounted for the mixture of good and evil in our world. Others assigned to matter, not an *eternal lord*, but an *architect* merely; and they represented one of those immortal beings whom God produced from himself, as impelled by some unforeseen chance to employ himself in reducing to order the matter which lay remote from the residence of God, and in fabricating mankind. Others again set up a sort of triumvirate, considering the supreme Deity to differ not only from the principle of matter, and of all evil, but also from the creator of this world.¹ When these three systems came to be dilated and explained, new controversies unavoidably arose, and numerous divisions followed; as might be expected from the nature of the case, and as the history of those Christian sects which followed this philosophy expressly declares.

§ 7. Yet, as all these sects set out upon one first principle, their disagreements did not prevent them from holding in common certain doctrines and opinions respecting God, the world, mankind, and some other points. Thus they all maintained the existence from eternity of a Being, full of goodness, wisdom, and the other virtues, of whom no mortal can form a complete idea,²—a Being who is the purest *light*, and is diffused through that boundless *space* to which they gave the Greek appellation of *Pleroma*;³ that this eternal and most perfect being, after existing alone and in absolute repose during an infinite period, produced out of himself two spirits, of different sexes, and both perfect resemblances of their parent; that from the marriage of these two spirits, others of a similar nature originated; that successive generations ensued; and thus in process of time a *celestial family* was formed in the *Pleroma*. This divine progeny being unchangeable and quite incapable of perishing, these philosophers chose to impose upon it the name of *Αἰὼν*, *Æon*, a term which signifies an eternal nature, not liable to time and its vicissitudes.⁴ But how

¹ [This appears to have been the main feature of the religious reformation introduced into Persia, by Zerdusht, or Zoroaster, whom Plutarch places five thousand years before the Trojan war, but who is thought really to have lived under Darius Hystaspes. Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 48. S.]

² ['Beside the name of *first Father*, or *first Principle*, they called him also *Bythus*, as if to denote the unfathomable nature of his perfections.'—Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 36. S.]

Fulness (*Μαχλ.*). ['Michaelis uses it for a *heaven*, that is, a *place*.—The Easterns conceived a *πλήρωμα*, in the sense of a system, or complete *company*, made up of God and his attendant *αἰῶνες*; also in the sense of a space occupied by them: and it would generally be difficult to say in which of these senses the word was used; for if a man, or superior being, was admitted into

the *πλήρωμα*, in the first sense, he would be also in the second. Being admitted into a *company* is being admitted into the *place* occupied by that company; as admission into a *family* is admission into the *house* where that family resides.' Hey's *Lectures*, i. 262. S.]

⁴ [The word *αἰὼν* properly signifies an *infinite*, or, at least, *indefinite duration*, and is opposed to a finite or a temporary duration. But by metonymy it was used to designate immutable *beings* who exist for ever. It was so used, even by the Greek philosophers, about the commencement of the Christian era; as appears from a passage in Arrian, *Diss. Epictet.* ii. § 5, where *αἰὼν* is opposed to *ἄνθρωπος*, or to a frail, changeable being. Οὐ γὰρ εἰμὶ αἰὼν ἀλλ' ἄνθρωπος, μέρος τῶν πάντων, ὡς ἕρα ἡμέρας· ἐνστήναί με δεῖ ὡς τὴν ἕραν, καὶ παρελθεῖν ὡς ἕραν. 'I am not, an *Æon* (an eternal and unchangeable being), but a

numerous these *Æons* were, was a subject of controversy among them.¹

§ 8. Beyond the region of light where God and his family dwell,² exists a rude and unformed mass of matter, heaving itself continually in wild commotion. This was not only set in order at a certain time by one of the celestial race that had gotten out of the *Pleroma*, either by some chance or by God's direction, but was adorned likewise with men, and other animals of different kinds, with various things besides, and then tempered and corrected with a certain portion of light and celestial matter.³ This Fabricator of the world, who was distinguished from the supreme Deity, ordinarily bore the name of *Demiurge*.⁴ Now, he is one that, with many distinguished qualities, has a natural arrogance and greediness of rule. He asserts, therefore, a claim of unquestionable right to the empire of that new world, which was constructed by him, wholly excluding the supreme Deity, and requiring divine honours from mankind for himself and his associates in government.

§ 9. Men were compounded of an earthy and vicious body, joined with a soul, plucked somehow from the Deity himself, and of heavenly kind. Of which parts, the nobler, the soul, that is, miserably suffers under the body, which is the seat of all lusts, being not only drawn away by it from knowing and worshipping the Great Supreme, to the fear and reverence of this world's Creator and his associates, but also filled with love of things that are earthy and please the senses. From this wretched bondage God labours to rescue his daughters in various ways; and especially by the messengers whom he often sends to them. But the *Demiurge* and his associates, eager to retain their power, resist, so far as it is possible, the divine purpose of recalling souls back to himself, and with great pains obscure all knowledge of the supreme Deity. Meanwhile, such souls as renounce the framers

man; and a part of the universe, as an hour is a part of the day; like an hour I must exist, and then pass away.'—It was therefore not a novel application of the term *αἰών* by the Gnostics, to use it as the designation of a celestial and immortal *being*. And even the fathers of the ancient church apply the term to *angels*, both good and bad. That *all* who were addicted to the oriental philosophy, whether Greeks or not, used the term in this sense, appears from a passage in Manes, the Persian, who, as Augustine testifies, called the celestial beings *αἰῶνες*, or, as Augustine translates it, *secula*. Some have supposed it so used even in the *New Test.*, e.g. Ephes. ii. 2, and Heb. i. 2. Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ.* §c. p. 30.]

¹ [These imaginary beings, called sometimes *Æons*, from their existence before time was, at other times *Emanations*, from the mode of their production, were represented as more or less numerous, according to different schemes. Each pair was inferior to that which produced it, so that the whole

race gradually deteriorated as its members sprang forth at greater distances from the original divine emanator. Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 36. S.]

² [Cf. Milton, *Par. Lost*, B. iii. 1. S.]

³ [After the form and fashion of an ideal world, which existed in the *Pleroma*, or in the mind of the supreme God.—Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 37. S.]

⁴ [That is, *Creator*; or, more closely, *the Artificer*. Δημιουργεῖ τὰ μὴ ὄντα ποιεῖ.—Δημιουργός χειροτέχνης, κατασκευαστής. (Hesych.) Prometheus, in classical mythology, is evidently the oriental *Demiurge*. He formed men of clay, which Lucian represents as a crime against heaven, and then stole fire from above for their use. The latter charge shows the Greeks to have borrowed the fable without understanding it. Its eastern inventors made their hero steal fire, not for the ordinary use of man, but for animating him with a reasonable soul of heavenly origin. S.]

and rulers of this world, lifting themselves up towards their real parent, and repressing the motions excited by depraved matter, go straight, when freed from the body, into the *Pleroma*; while those which continue in the bondage of superstition and matter must pass into other bodies, till they are sufficiently aroused. Yet God will ultimately prevail; and having restored to liberty most of the souls now imprisoned in bodies, will dissolve the fabric of the world; the primitive tranquillity will then return, and God will reign with the happy spirits in undisturbed felicity to all eternity.

§ 10. What face was worn among the Jews by learning generally, and by philosophy in particular, may be judged from such things as have been already said in discoursing of that nation. Many in it, we may first remark, as appears from the New Testament itself, taught and preached up, when that book was written, the recondite knowledge which they call *Cabbala*. Now this is a system very nearly akin in many things to that philosophy which we call *oriental*; or rather it is this philosophy itself, accommodated to the Jewish religion, and tempered with some mixture of truth.¹ Nor were the Jews, at that time, wholly ignorant of the Grecian doctrines; for some of them had actually been incorporated into their own religion, from the age of *Alexander* the Great. Of the opinions which they had adopted from the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, and the Syrians, I shall say nothing.²

§ 11. The Greeks are regarded, by most writers, as continuing to hold the first rank in learning and philosophy. There were among them, at that time especially at Athens, acute and eloquent men, who, besides teaching the precepts of philosophy, as held by the ancient sects founded by Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Epicurus, instructed youth in the principles of eloquence and polite literature. So that such as were eager for learning resorted in great numbers to Greece from all quarters. Nor was there a smaller supply of Greek philosophers and rhetoricians to be found at Alexandria, in Egypt; which caused a similar concourse to that place, as if to a mart of liberal arts.

§ 12. Among the Romans in this age every branch of learning and science was cultivated. The children of good families were, from their earliest years, instructed especially in Grecian learning and eloquence; they next applied themselves to philosophy and jurisprudence; lastly, they sought in Greece the higher branches of intellectual cultivation.³ Among the philosophers, none were more acceptable to the Romans than the Epicureans and Academics, whom the leading men followed in great numbers, in order to spend life in pleasure without fear of consequences. While *Augustus* lived, cultivators of elegant literature were in high credit. But after his death, the suc-

¹ [‘The Jewish *Cabbala* may be loosely defined to be a mystical system, affecting the theory and practice of religion, founded upon oral tradition.’—Burton’s *Bampton Lectures*, 51. S.]

² See J. F. Buddeus, *Introductio in Historiam Philos. Hebræorum*; and the writers named by Wolfius, *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, t.

iii. [but especially Brucker’s *Hist. Crit. Philos.*, t. ii. period ii. pt. i. l. ii. c. i. p. 652. *Schl.*]

³ See Paganini Gaudentii *liber de Philosophiæ apud Romanos initio et progressu*, in the 5th vol. of the *Nova variorum scriptorum collectio*, Halle, 1747, 8vo, 2nd edition.

ceeding emperors being more intent on the arts of war than those of peace, these studies generally sank into neglect.

§ 13. The other nations, as the Germans, Celts, and Britons, were certainly not destitute of men distinguished for their genius and acumen. In Gaul, the inhabitants of Marseilles had long been much famed for their attention to learning:¹ and they had, doubtless, diffused knowledge among the neighbouring tribes. Among the Celts, the *Druids*, who were priests, philosophers, and legislators, were renowned for their wisdom; but the accounts of them now extant are not sufficient to acquaint us with the nature of their philosophy.² The Romans moreover introduced literature and philosophy into all the countries which they brought under their subjection, with a view of softening the popular manners and gradually bringing about civilisation.³

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Necessity of teachers in the church—§ 2. Extraordinary teachers—§ 3. Authority of the Apostles—§ 4. The seventy disciples—§ 5. Christ nowhere determined the form of his church. Constitution of the church of Jerusalem—§ 6. Rights of the people. Contributions for the public expense—§ 7. Equality of the members. Rights of initiation. Catechumens and the faithful—§ 8. Order of rulers. Presbyters—§ 9. Prophets—§ 10. Deacons of the church at Jerusalem. Deaconesses—§ 11. Bishops—§ 12. Character of episcopacy in this century—§ 13. Origin of dioceses, and rural bishops—§ 14. Whether there were councils and metropolitans in the *first* century—§ 15. The principal writers; the apostles—§ 16. Time of completion of the canon—§ 17. Apocryphal writings and *pseudepigrapha*—§ 18. Clemens Romanus—§ 19. Writings falsely ascribed to him—§ 20. Ignatius of Antioch—§ 21. Polycarp, Barnabas, Hermas—§ 22. Character of the apostolic fathers.

§ 1. As it was our Saviour's will to collect a society for himself out of all the nations in the earth, one too which should continually keep increasing, he necessarily began by choosing certain individuals to act as his *ambassadors* to the human race, and as *extraordinary teachers*. After these had established religious bodies everywhere, it was needful for him to provide for placing *ordinary teachers*, and interpreters of his will, in the societies that had been formed, who

¹ See the *Histoire littéraire de la France, par des Religieux Bénédictins*, Diss. prelim. p. 42, &c.

² Ja. Martini, *Religion des Gaulois*, liv. i. cap. 21, p. 175; and various others who have written concerning the Druids. [This work of Martin is said to be far inferior to the following: viz. *Histoire des Celtes et particulièrement des Gaulois et des Germains, par Sim. Pelloutier, augmentée par M. de Chinac*, Paris, 1771, 8 vols, 12mo,

and 2 vols 4to; also Fréret, *Obs. sur la nature et les dogmes de la relig. Gauloise*; in the *Histoire de l'Acad. des Inscript.* t. xviii.; and his *Obs. sur la relig. des Gaulois*, &c., in the *Mémoires de Littérature, tirés des registres de l'Acad. des Inscript.* t. xxiv. Paris, 1756.—Also the introductory part of *Alsatia Illustrata*, autore J. Dan. Schoepflino, i. § 96. Colmar. 1751, fol.—*Tr.*]

³ Juvenal, *Sat.* xv. 110—113.

should not only repeat the doctrines which were learnt from the *extraordinary* ones, but also keep the people to their faith and practice. For any religion will gradually be corrupted and become extinct, unless there are persons continually at hand, who shall explain and inculcate it.

§ 2. The *extraordinary* teachers, whom *Christ* employed in setting up his kingdom, were those intimate friends of his whom the Scriptures denominate *apostles*; and those *seventy disciples*, of whom mention was made above. To these, I apprehend, must be added those who are called *evangelists*; that is, as I suppose, those who were either sent forth to instruct the people by the apostles, or who, of their own accord, forsaking other employments, assumed the office of promulgating the truths which *Christ* taught.¹ And to these, we must further add those to whom, in the infancy of the church, God imparted ability to speak in foreign languages, which they had never learned. For he on whom the divine goodness conferred the *gift of tongues*, was bound, in my judgment, to infer from the thing itself, that God designed to employ *his* ministry in propagating the Christian religion.²

§ 3. Many have undertaken to write the history of the *apostles*; although it is a theme replete with fables, doubts, and difficulties, when we take leave of the particulars that are found in the books of the New Testament, and in the more ancient writers of Christian affairs.³ Now, an apostle was a man *divinely instructed* and sent by *Christ* to mortals, with the power of *making laws, coercing the guilty and depraved*, when it should seem advisable, and of *working miracles* besides, when there should appear occasion for them. Thus he was to make known everywhere the divine will, and the way of salvation, separating such as obeyed God's voice from the remaining crowd, and binding them together by the tie of a society.⁴

§ 4. Our knowledge of the *seventy disciples* of *Christ* is still more imperfect than that of the apostles; for they are but once mentioned in the New Testament.⁵ Catalogues of them, indeed, are extant; but these being made up by the later Greeks, have little or no authority and credibility. Their mission was, as appears plain from the very words of *Luke*, solely to the Jewish nation. Yet it is very probable, that after the Saviour's ascension to heaven, they performed the duties of *evangelists*, and taught, in various countries, the way of salvation which they had learned from *Christ*.⁶

¹ Ephes. iv. 11. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 37.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 22, &c.

³ These writers are enumerated by Casp. Sagittarius, *Introductio ad historiam eccles.* cap. i. p. 2; and by J. Fr. Buddeus, *de Ecclesia Apostolica*, p. 673, &c. [See above, p. i. c. iv. § 6, notes. Tr.]

⁴ See Fred. Spanheim, *de Apostolis et Apostolatu*, Opp. ii. 289, &c. In ascribing legislative powers to the apostles, I have proceeded considerably, and, as I think, on good grounds. I am aware that eminent

men, at this day, deny them this power; but perhaps they differ from me more in words than in reality. [Mosheim founded his opinion on Matt. x. 20; John xiii. 20; Luke x. 16; 1 Tim. iii. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 1—4, 34; and Titus i. 5. See his *Instit. hist. Christ. majores*, p. 158, &c. Schl.]

⁵ Luke x. 1.

⁶ Catalogues of the seventy disciples are extant, subjoined to the *Libri III. de Vita et Morte Mosi*, elucidated by Gilbert Gaulmin; and again published by J. A. Fabri-

§ 5. As to the external *form* of the church and the mode of governing it, neither *Christ* himself nor his apostles gave any express precepts. We are therefore to understand, that a very large portion of this thing is committed to the times, and to the prudence of those who direct public affairs in both their branches.¹ If, however, as no Christian doubts, the apostles of *Jesus Christ* acted by divine command and guidance, then that form of the first Christian bodies, which found its way to all other churches from the one organised at Jerusalem by the very men who had been intimate with Christ, must be taken for *divine*. From this, however, you will not make out that it is eternal and immutable. Now, each Christian association, in those primitive times, was composed of the *people*, the *presiding officers*, and the *assistants* or *deacons*. These *must be* the component

cious, *Bibliotheca Greca*, p. 474. [See note on Cent. i. p. i. c. 3, § 6. Tr.]

¹ [Those who imagine that *Christ* himself, or the apostles by his direction and authority, appointed a certain fixed *form of church government*, are not agreed what that form was. The principal opinions that have been adopted upon this head, may be reduced to the four following. The first is, that of the *Roman Catholics*, who maintained that Christ's intention and appointment was, that his followers should be collected into *one sacred empire*, subjected to the government of *St. Peter* and his successors, and divided, like the kingdoms of this world, into several provinces; that, in consequence thereof, *Peter* fixed the seat of ecclesiastical dominion at *Rome*, but afterwards, to alleviate the burthen of his office, divided the church into three greater provinces, according to the division of the world at that time, and appointed a person to preside in each, who was dignified with the title of *patriarch*; that the European patriarch resided at *Rome*, the Asiatic at *Antioch*, and the African at *Alexandria*; that the bishops of each province, among whom there were various ranks, were to reverence the authority of their respective patriarchs, and that both bishops and patriarchs were to be passively subject to the supreme dominion of the *Roman Pontiff*. See Leo Allatius, *de perpetuo Consensu eccles. Orient. et Occident.* lib. i. cap. ii.; and Morin, *Exercitat. ecclesiast.* lib. i. Exerc. i. This romantic account scarcely deserves a serious refutation.—The second opinion concerning the government of the church, makes no mention of a *supreme head*, or of *patriarchs* constituted by divine authority; but it supposes that the apostles divided the Roman empire into as many *ecclesiastical provinces* as there were secular or civil ones; that the *metropolitan bishop*, i. e. the prelate who resided in the capital city of each province, presided over the clergy of that province; and that

the other bishops were subject to his authority. This opinion has been adopted by some of the most learned of the *Romish church* (Petrus de Marca de *Concord. sacerdot. et imperii*, lib. vi. cap. i. Morin, *Exerc. eccles.* lib. i. Exerc. xviii.; and Pagi, *Critica in Annal. Baronii*, ad ann. 37, i. 29), and has also been favoured by some of the most eminent British divines (Hammond, *Diss. de Episcop.*; Beverege, *Cod. Canon. vet. eccles. vindic.* lib. ii. cap. v. tom. ii. *Patr. Apostol.* and Ussher, *de Origine episcop. et metropol.* p. 20). Some Protestant writers of note have endeavoured to prove that it is not supported by sufficient evidence (Basnage, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, tom. i. livr. i. cap. 8. Boehmer, *Annot. ad Petrum de Marca de Concordia sacerdot. et imperii*, p. 143).—The third opinion is that of those who acknowledge that when the Christians began to multiply exceedingly, metropolitans, patriarchs, and archbishops were indeed created, but only by *human* appointment and authority; though they confess at the same time, that it is *consonant to the orders and intentions of Christ* and his apostles, that there should be, in every Christian church, one person invested with the highest authority, and clothed with certain rights and privileges, above the other doctors of that assembly. This opinion has been embraced by many English divines of the first rank in the learned world, and also by many in other countries and communions.—The fourth and last opinion is that of the *presbyterians*, who affirm that *Christ's* intention was, that the Christian doctors and ministers should all enjoy the same rank and authority, without any sort of preeminence or subordination, or any distinction of rights and privileges.—The reader will find an ample account of these four different opinions with respect to church government in Dr. Mosheim's larger history of the first century. Maclaine.]

parts of every society. The highest authority was in the *people*, or the whole body of Christians; for even the apostles themselves inculcated by their example, that nothing of any moment was to be done, or determined on, but with the knowledge and consent of the brotherhood.¹ And this mode of proceeding both prudence and necessity required in those early times.

§ 6. The assembled people, therefore, elected their own presiding officers and teachers, or freely approved such as came recommended by others. They also either repudiated laws, proposed by the presiding officers at their meetings, or voted for making them binding: they both excluded and readmitted wicked and unworthy members; they decided the controversies and disputes that arose; they heard and determined the causes of presbyters and deacons; in a word, they did everything which marks the parties invested with *supreme power* in any state. All these rights the people paid for by supplying the funds necessary for supporting the teachers, the deacons, and the poor, for strengthening the common interest, and warding off unforeseen dangers. These funds consisted of voluntary contributions of every kind, brought by individuals, according to their abilities, to their public meetings, and usually called *oblations*.

§ 7. Among all members of the church, whatever might be their account or condition, there was the most perfect equality. This they manifested by their love-feasts, by calling each other *brethren* and *sisters*, and in other ways. Nor in this first age was there any distinction between the initiated and candidates for initiation. For whoever professed to regard *Jesus Christ* as the Saviour of the world, and to depend on him alone for salvation, was immediately baptized, and admitted into the church. But in the process of time, as Christianity extended, it was deemed advisable, if not necessary, to distribute the people into the two classes of *faithful* and *catechumens*.² The former, being such as had been solemnly taken into the society by baptism, might be present at all the parts of religious worship, and enjoy the right of voting in meetings of the church. The latter, being yet unconsecrated by the lustral sacrament, were neither admitted to the common prayers, nor the sacred supper, nor to the meetings.

§ 8. The presiding officers of the church were denominated, sometimes *presbyters* or *elders*, a designation borrowed from the Jews, and indicative rather of the wisdom than the age of the persons; and sometimes, also, *bishops*: for it is most manifest, that *both terms* are promiscuously used in the New Testament for one class of persons.³ These were men of gravity, and distinguished for their

¹ Acts i. 15; vi. 3; xv. 4; xxi. 22.

² [Euseb. *Demonstratio Evangelica*, vii. 2.]

³ Acts xx. 17, 28. Phil. i. 1. Tit. i. 5, 7. 1 Tim. iii. 1.

[Yet the N. T. contains a caution to Timothy against accusations of an 'elder' (*presbyter*) unsupported by two or three witnesses, speaks of Titus as left in Crete to 'set in order the things wanting, and ordain

elders in every city,' and mentions individual 'angels' in connexion with the seven Asian churches. (1 Tim. v. 19. Tit. i. 5. Rev. i. 20.) The ancient and obvious explanations of these texts are, that Timothy was bishop of Ephesus, Titus of Crete, and that each of the Asian churches had its own bishop. S.]

reputation, influence, and sanctity.¹ Some of them, it is commonly inferred from St. Paul's words,² *taught* the people, others rendered public services in some other way. If, however, this distinction between *teaching* and *ruling elders* ever existed at all, which I neither affirm nor deny, it certainly does not seem to have been of long continuance, for St. Paul requires of *all* presbyters or bishops, that they be *able to teach* and instruct others.³

§ 9. As few among the first professors of Christianity were learned men, and fit for imbuing with a knowledge of heavenly things minds unprepared for it, God saw the necessity of raising up, in many churches, extraordinary teachers, to discourse, when the Christians met, on things pertaining to religion, and reason with the people in his own words. These are the persons who in the New Testament are called *prophets*.⁴ The functions of these men are limited too much by those who make it to have been their sole business to expound the Old Testament scriptures, and especially the prophetic books.⁵ Whoever professed to be such a herald of God was allowed publicly to address the people; but there were present among the hearers divinely constituted judges, who were at no loss to distinguish true prophets from false ones. The order of prophets ceased when the necessity for them was past.

§ 10. That the church had its public servants or *deacons*, from its first foundation, he will not doubt who recollects that no society can be without such persons, but least of all, bodies like the first ones formed among Christians. Those *young men*, accordingly, who carried out the corpses of *Ananias* and his wife, were, without question, the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, attendant upon the apostles, when it met, and awaiting their commands.⁶ These first

¹ 1 Tim. iii. 1. Tit. i. 5.

² 1 Tim. v. 17.

³ 1 Tim. iii. 2. See concerning the word *presbyter*, Camp. Vitringa, *de Synagoga vetere*, lib. iii. p. i. cap. i. p. 609, and J. Bened. Carpzov. *Exercit. in epist. ad Hebræos, ex Philone*, p. 499. On the thing itself, or rather the *persons* designated by this title, see J. Fr. Buddeus, *Ecclesia Apostol.* cap. vi. p. 719, and Christoph. Matt. Pfaff, *de Originibus juris eccles.* p. 49.

⁴ Rom. xii. 6. 1 Cor. xii. 28; xiv. 3, 29. Ephes. iv. 21.

⁵ See Mosheim's *Diss. de illis, qui propheta vocantur in N. T.* [in *Diss. ad Hist. Eccl. pertinentes*, t. ii. p. 125, &c.; also Witsius, *Miscell. Sacra*, tom. i. Koppe, *Eccurs. III. in Epistolam ad Ephes.* and Schleusner, *Lexicon in N. Test.* art. *προφήτης*, no. 10. Tr.]

⁶ Acts v. 6, 10. Those who may be surprised that I should consider the *young men*, who interred the bodies of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, to be the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, are desired to consider, that the words *νεώτεροι* and *νεανίσκοι*, *young men*, are not always indicative of *age*; but often, both among the Greeks and Latins, indicate a

function or office. For the same change is made in these words, as in the word *presbyter*, which everyone knows is indicative, sometimes of age, and sometimes merely of office. As, therefore, the word *presbyter* often denotes the rulers or head men of a society or association, without any regard to their age; so also the terms *young men* and *the younger* not unfrequently denote the *servants*, or *those that stand in waiting*; because ordinarily men in the vigour of life perform this office. Nor is this use of the word foreign from the New Testament. The Saviour himself seems to use the word *νεώτερος* in this sense, Luke xxii. 26, *ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν, γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος*. The word *μείζων*, he himself explains by *ἡγούμενος*, so that it is equivalent to *ruler* or *presbyter*: and instead of *νεώτερος*, he in the next clause uses *ὁ διακονῶν*, which places our interpretation beyond all controversy. So that *μείζων* and *νεώτερος* are not here indicative of certain ages, but of certain offices; and the precept of *Christ* amounts to this: 'Let not him that performs the office of a presbyter or elder among you, think himself superior to the public servants or deacons.'—Still more

deacons of that body were chosen from Jews born in Palestine, and as they were thought by individuals of the nations who came from foreign parts to show party-spirit in distributing benefits, the apostles caused seven other public servants, or deacons, to be appointed for that portion of the church at Jerusalem which consisted of Jews who had lived or were born abroad.¹ Six of these were complete foreigners, as their names bear witness; but *one* was taken from the *proselytes*, a class of persons that supplied many of the first Christians at Jerusalem, and hence could as fairly claim attention as Jews who had lived in other countries. The example of the church of Jerusalem being followed by all other Christian bodies, in obedience to the injunctions of the apostles, *they* likewise appointed *deacons*.² There were also, in many churches, and especially in those of Asia, female public servants or *deaconesses*; who were matrons or widows of unquestionable character, that attended to the poor, and discharged other duties.³

§ 11. In this manner Christians managed ecclesiastical affairs so long as their congregations were small, or not very numerous. Three or four presbyters, men of gravity and holiness, placed over those little societies, could easily proceed with harmony, and needed no head or president. But when, as churches grew larger, there was an increased number not only of presbyters and inferior ministers, but also of labours and occupations varying in character, it became necessary that the council of presbyters should have a *president*, a man of distinguished gravity and prudence, who should distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and be as it were the central point of the whole society. He was at first denominated *the angel*,⁴ but afterwards *the bishop*; that word in Greek⁵ being indicative of his principal business. It would seem that the church of

evident is the passage 1 Peter v. 5, *ὑποτάξτε τοῖς πρεσβυτέρους ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ*. It is manifest from what goes before, that *presbyter* here is indicative of rank or office, denoting *teacher* or *ruler* in the church; therefore its counterpart, *νεώτερος*, has the same import, and does not denote persons young in years, but the servants or *deacons* of the church. *Peter*, after solemnly exhorting the *presbyters* not to abuse the power committed to them, turns to the *deacons* and says, 'And likewise ye younger, i.e. ye *deacons*, despise not the orders of the presbyters, but perform cheerfully whatever they require of you.'—In this same sense, the term is used by *Luke*, Acts v. 6, 10, where *νεώτεροι* or *νεανίσκοι* are the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, the very persons, whom, a little after, the Hellenists accused before the apostles of not distributing properly the contributions for the poor. I might confirm this sense of the term *young men*, by numerous citations from Greek and Latin writers, both sacred and profane; but this is not the place for such demonstrations.

¹ Acts vi. 1.

² 1 Tim. iii. 8, 9.

³ For an account of the *deacons* and *deaconesses* of the ancient churches, see Casp. Ziegler, *de Diaconis et diaconissis*, Wittemb. 1678, 4to. S. Basnage, *Annales polit. eccles.* ad ann. 35, i. 450. Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiast.* book ii. ch. 20 [and Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 118, &c., where he defends, at great length, his somewhat peculiar views, respecting the *seven deacons* of the church at Jerusalem.]

⁴ Apoc. ii. iii. [The title of *angel* occurs only in the Apocalypse, a highly poetic book. It was not, probably, the common title of the presiding presbyter; and certainly was not an *older* title than that of *bishop*, which is so often used by St. Paul in his epistles, which were written long before the Apocalypse. See Schlegel's note here. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Ἐπίσκοπος, an *Inspector*, or *Overseer*, with which the Latin *Episcopus* is identical, and from which the word expressive of that officer in all European languages is derived. S.]

Jerusalem, when grown very numerous, after the dispersion of the apostles among foreign nations, was the *first* to elect such a president, and that other churches in process of time followed the example.¹

§ 12. Those, however, who judge of bishops in the first and golden age of Christianity from their successors in the following centuries, blend and confound characters that are very different. For in this century and the next, a bishop had charge of a *single* church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house; nor was he its *lord*, but in reality its *minister* and servant; instructing the people, conducting all parts of public worship, and attending on the sick and necessitous in person. Undoubtedly, such things as he could not manage and perform he committed to the presbyters; but he had no power to decree or sanction anything until it was approved by the presbyters and people.² The emoluments of this singularly laborious and perilous office were very small. For the churches had no revenues, except the voluntary contributions of the people, or *oblations*; which, moderate as they doubtless were, were divided among bishop, presbyters, deacons, and poor.

§ 13. It was not long, however, before the extent of episcopal jurisdiction and power was enlarged. For the bishops who lived in cities, either themselves, or through their presbyters, gathered new churches in the neighbouring towns and country. As these churches continued under the protection and care of the bishops by whose ministry or procurement they received Christianity, ecclesiastical provinces were gradually formed, which the Greeks afterwards denominated *dioceses*. The persons to whom the city bishops committed the government and instruction of these village and rural churches, were called *chorepiscopi*,³ that is, bishops of some country place or district. They were a sort of intermediate class between bishops and presbyters, being inferior to the former, superior to the latter.⁴

¹ [Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ. &c.* p. 134, in a long note, argues from the traditional accounts of a longer catalogue of bishops in the church of Jerusalem than in any other church, during the first ages, that the church of Jerusalem must be supposed to have had bishops *earlier* than any other. *Tr.* — The first in the series of bishops of Jerusalem is said by Eusebius to have been James, known as our Lord's brother, and surnamed the Just. (*H. E.* ii. 1.) Some have identified him with James, the son of Alphaeus, thus making him one of the twelve apostles: but Eusebius (i. 12) places him among the seventy disciples. His importance in the church of Jerusalem appears to have been established at least as early as the third year after St. Paul's conversion. (*Gal.* i. 19.) Subsequently, Scripture makes him leader in the settlement of that question respecting Mosaic obligations, which occupied what is called the council of Jerusalem. (*Acts* xv. 13.) Unless ancient profane authority had been correct in designating him Bishop of

Jerusalem, the scriptural accounts of his prominence there are far from intelligible. *S.]*

² [All that is here stated, may be clearly proved from the records of the first centuries; and has been proved by Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiast.* Beverege, *Codex Canon. primit. ecclesiæ*, and others. Mosheim, *de Reb. Chr. &c.* p. 136.]

³ [Τῆς χώρας ἐπίσκοποι. *Murd.*]

⁴ [Learned men, who have written largely on the subject, have debated whether the *chorepiscopi* ranked with *bishops*, or with *presbyters*. See J. Morin, *De sacris eccles. ordinat.* pt. i. exerc. iv. D. Blondel, *de Episc. et Presbyt.* sec. iii. Beverege, *Pandect. Canon.* ii. 176. C. Ziegler, *de Episcopis*, l. i. c. 13, p. 105, &c. Peter de Marca, *de Concordia sacerdot. et imperii*, l. ii. cap. 13, 14. Boehmer, *Adnott. ad Petrum de Marca*, p. 62, 63. L. Thomassin, *Disciplina eccles. vet. et nova*, pt. i. l. ii. c. 1, p. 215. — But they did not belong entirely to either of those orders. Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ. &c.* p. 137.]

§ 14. All the churches of primitive time were *independent* bodies, no one of them owing subjection to any other. If they were, indeed, founded by an apostle, they had often the honour of being consulted in difficult and doubtful cases; yet they had no judicial authority, no control, no power of giving laws. On the contrary, it is clear as the noon-day, that all Christian churches had *equal rights*, and were in all respects on a footing of equality. Nor does there appear, in this first age, any vestige of that *consociation* of churches in the same province which gave rise to *councils* and *metropolitans*. Rather is it established, that, in the *second* century, a custom of holding councils took its rise in Greece, and thence extended into other provinces.¹

§ 15. Among the Christian teachers whose writings rendered an additional service to the church, the first rank is clearly due to the *apostles*, and to certain of their disciples, whom God moved to place on record the deeds of *Christ* and his apostles. The writings of these men are collected into one volume, and are in the hands of all who profess to be Christians. For such matters as concern the history of these heavenly books,² and for arguments by which their divine authority and uncorrupted integrity are proved,³ those learned men are to be consulted who have written professedly on such subjects.

§ 16. As to the time *when* and the persons *by whom* the books of the New Testament were collected into one body, there are various opinions, or rather conjectures, of the learned; for the subject is attended with great and almost inexplicable difficulties to us of these latter times.⁴ It must suffice us to know, that before the middle of the *second* century, most of the books composing the New Testament were in every Christian church throughout the known world, and were read and regarded as the divine rule of faith and practice. And hence it may be concluded, that it was while some of the apostles were still living, or certainly while their disciples and immediate successors were everywhere to be met with, that these books were carefully distinguished from other things written by man.⁵ That those *four* of them which are called *Gospels* were combined during the

¹ It is commonly said that the meeting of the church in Jerusalem, which is described *Acts* xv. was the *first Christian council*. But this is a perversion of the import of the term *council*. For that meeting was a conference of only a single church, called together for deliberation; and if such meetings may be called *ecclesiastical councils*, a multitude of them were held in those primitive times. An *ecclesiastical council* is a meeting of *delegates* from a number of *confederate churches*. [This seems an arbitrary definition. *Ed.*]

² See on this subject, J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, l. iv. c. v. p. 122—227 [and Jer. Jones, *Method of settling the canonical authority of the N. T.*, 3 vols. 8vo, and the modern *Introductions to the books of the N. T.* in English, by T. H. Horne, and

J. D. Michaelis, ed. Marsh; and in German, by Haenlin, Krug, Bertholdt, Eichhorn, &c. *Tr.*]

³ The [early] writers in defence of the divine authority of the N. T. are enumerated by J. A. Fabricius, *Delectus argumentorum et syllabus scriptor. pro verit. relig. Christianæ*, cap. 26, p. 502. [On the subject itself, the modern writers are numerous, and generally known. Lardner and Paley still hold the first rank among the English. *Tr.*]

⁴ See Jo. Ens, *Biblioth. sacra, seu diatriba de libror. N. T. canone*, Amstel. 1710, 8vo, and Jo. Mills, *Prolegom. ad N. T.* sec. i. p. 23, &c. [Westcott on the Canon, Camb. 1855. *Ed.*]

⁵ See Jo. Frick, *de Cura veteris ecclesiæ circa canon.* cap. iii. p. 86, &c.

lifetime of *St. John*, and that the first three were approved by this holy personage, we learn from the testimony of *Eusebius*.¹ And why may we not suppose that the other books of the New Testament were collected into one body at the same time?

§ 17. Besides other causes requiring this to be done early, there was one that rendered it absolutely necessary, namely, a variety of commentaries, filled with impostures and fables, on our Saviour's life and sentiments, composed soon after his ascent into heaven, by men who, without being bad, perhaps were superstitious, simple, and piously deceitful. To these were afterwards added other writings falsely ascribed to the most holy apostles by fraudulent individuals.²

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 24.

² Such as remain of these spurious works have been carefully collected by J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus N. Test.*, 2 vols. 12mo, pp. 2006. Hamb. 2nd ed. 1719. Many learned remarks on them occur in Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire critique des dogmes de Manichéisme*, liv. ii. p. 337. &c. [No one of all the books contained in the *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* of Fabricius, speaks disrespectfully of *Christ*, of his religion, his apostles and followers, or of the canonical books of the N. T. They were evidently composed with a design to subserve the cause of Christianity. They aim to supply *deficiencies* in the true Gospels and Acts, or to *extend* the history by means of oral traditions and supplementary accounts, professedly composed by apostles, or apostolic men. At least, this is true of those books which bear the title of *Gospels*, *Acts*, and *Epistles*. These were all designed, either *first* to gratify the laudable curiosity of Christians, and subserve the cause of piety: or, *secondly*, to put to silence the enemies of Christianity, whether Jews or pagans, by demonstrating, from alleged facts and testimony, that Jesus was the Messiah, his doctrines divine, his apostles inspired, &c., or, *lastly*, to display the ingenuity of the writer, and to gratify the fancy by a harmless fiction. The only parts of this collection which do not seem to me to fall under one or the other of these classes, are such as by mistake have been ascribed to the apostles and evangelists: such as the Liturgies, Creed, and Canons, which go under their names. Of those which are *lost* no judgment can be formed but by testimony. Perhaps, some of them were composed with hostile views towards the canonical scriptures.—The *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* contains: 1. 'The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary,' Latin, in 10 sections. p. 19—38. — 2. 'The Previous Gospel (Protevangelium), ascribed to James the Just, the brother of our Lord,' Gr. and Lat. in 25 sections. p. 66—125. — 3. 'The Gospel of the Infancy of Christ, ascribed to Thomas the Apostle,' Gr.

and Lat. in 7 sections, p. 156—167. — 4. 'The Gospel of the Infancy, translated from the Arabic, by Henry Sikes,' Lat. in 55 sections, p. 168—211. It is the aim of all these to supply deficiencies in the *beginning* of the true Gospels, by acquainting us more fully with the history of the Virgin Mary, Joseph, Elisabeth, &c., and with the birth, infancy, and childhood of Christ.—Next follow, 5. 'The Gospel of Nicodemus,' or, as it is sometimes called, 'The Acts of Pilate,' relating to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, Latin, in 27 sections, p. 238—298. — 6. 'Three epistles of Pilate to Tiberius the emperor,' giving account of the condemnation, death, and resurrection of Christ; Latin, about 2 pages. — 7. 'The epistle of Lentulus to the Roman senate,' describing the person and manners of Christ; Latin, *one page*.—The three last (No. 5, 6, 7) were intended to be valuable *appendages* to the true Gospels, and to contain irrefragable *proofs* that Jesus was the Messiah, and clothed with divine authority. — Then follow the writings ascribed to Christ himself: viz., his correspondence with Abgarus, king of Edessa: which is to be found in Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 13, and in various modern works. These letters seem to have higher claims to authenticity than any other pieces in this collection; and yet few, if any, of the judicious will now admit them to be genuine.—Fabricius next gives a *catalogue* of about forty apocryphal Gospels, or of all the spurious Gospels of which the slightest notice can be found in antiquity. These are all, of course, now lost, or buried in the rubbish of old libraries; except the few which are contained in the previous list. — Vol. i. pt. ii. begins with 'The apocryphal *Acts* of the Apostles, or the history of their conflicts; ascribed to Abdias, the first bishop of Babelonia,' libr. x. Lat., p. 402—742. This history summarily recounts what the canonical books relate of each of the twelve apostles, and then follows them severally through their various travels and labours, till their death or martyrdom. It was probably compiled in the middle ages (it is

These worthless productions would have wrought great confusion, and would have rendered both the history and the religion of Christ uncertain, had not the rulers of churches taken care to separate without delay the books which were truly divine, and came from apostolic hands, from the mass of trash, and to form them into a volume by themselves.

§ 18. Next after the apostles, *Clement*, bishop of Rome, obtained very high reputation, as one of the writers of this century. The accounts that we have at this day of his life, actions, and death, are for the most part uncertain.¹ There are still extant *two epistles to the Corinthians*, bearing his name, written in Greek; of these, most people consider the second as falsely ascribed to the holy man by some deceiver;² the first is generally thought genuine. Yet even

first mentioned by James, a bishop of Genoa, in the thirteenth century), and by a monk, who was well acquainted with the ancient legendary tales, and who had good intentions; but who, nevertheless, was incompetent to distinguish what was true from what was false. Then follows a catalogue of all the ancient biographies of individual apostles and apostolic men, which Fabricius could hear of; in all, thirty-six in number. Many of these were professedly compiled several centuries after the apostles were dead, and all of them that still remain are mere legends, of little or no value. Most of those that have been published are to be met with in the Martyrologies and in the *Acta Sanctorum*. Fabricius next gives us apocryphal Epistles, ascribed to the Virgin Mary, to Paul, and to Peter. Mary's letters are but *three*, and those very short. One is addressed to St. Ignatius, in nine lines; another, to the people of Marseilles, in eleven lines; and the third, to the people of Florence, in four lines. To St. Paul is attributed a short Epistle to the Laodiceans, Gr. and Lat. It is a tolerable compilation from his genuine epistles. Then follows a gentlemanly but rapid correspondence, in Latin, said to have passed between St. Paul and Seneca, the Roman philosopher. It comprises fourteen short letters, full of compliments and of very little else. Paul's third epistle to the Corinthians has not had the honour to be published. There is one Epistle of the apostle Peter, addressed to the apostle James, still extant, in the *Clementina*, or spurious works of Clemens Romanus. Of spurious Revelations, Fabricius enumerates *twelve*; most of which are either lost, or have not been judged worth publishing. The Shepherd of Hermas and the fourth book of Esdras are the two best known, and the most valuable. The second volume of the *Codex* opens with the ancient Liturgies, going under the names of the apostles and evangelists. They are *six*; namely, those

which bear the names of St. James, St. Peter, St. John, St. Matthew, and St. Luke; together with a short prayer ascribed to St. John. These Liturgies, doubtless, are quite ancient. We may believe them to have been actually used by different churches, which supposed they were in accordance with the instructions of their favourite apostles. To these liturgies are subjoined *nine* Canons, or ecclesiastical laws, said to have been adopted in a council of the apostles held at Antioch; and finally, the Apostles' Creed, which many of the ancients supposed was formed by the apostles themselves. The Appendix to the *Codex* gleans up some fragments and additional notices of the pieces before mentioned, and then closes with the Shepherd of Hermas, accompanied with notes. *Tr.*—The apocryphal Gospels were edited by Dr. Tischendorf in 1853. The apocryphal Acts of the Apostles were collected and published by Dr. Tischendorf in 1851, Leipsic. They comprise the Acts of: 1. Philip; 2. Philip in Greece; 3. Matthew; 4. Consummatio Thomæ; 5. Bartholomew; 6. Thaddæus; 7. John; 8. Thomas; 9. Peter and Paul; 10. Andrew and Matthew; 11. Barnabas; 12. Andrew; 13. Paul and Thecla. *Ed.*]

¹ Subsequent to Tillemont [*Mémoires*, t. ii. pt. i. p. 279], Cotelier [*Patres Apostol.*], and Grabe [*Spicileg. Patrum*, sæc. i. p. 264, &c.] Philip Rondininus has collected all that is known of this great man, in the first of his two books, *de S. Clemente, papa et martyre, ejusque Basilica in urbe Roma*, Rome, 1706, 4to. [See also Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, i. 14—20, ed. 2nd. Clement was, perhaps, the person mentioned by Paul, *Philip.* iv. 3. He was one of the most distinguished Roman Christians, became bishop of Rome towards the close of the century, and is said to have lived till the third year of Trajan's reign, or about A.D. 100. *Tr.*]

² The editions of Clement's epistles to the Corinthians are mentioned by J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. iv. c. 5, p. 175,

this bears marks of alterations by some ill-judging person, who could not bear that so great a man should have written with so little erudition and ability.¹

§ 19. The other works which bear the name of *Clement*, namely, *the apostolic Canons*, *the apostolic Constitutions*, *the Recognitions of Clement*, and *the Clementina*,² were fraudulently ascribed to this eminent father by some deceiver, for the purpose of procuring them greater authority. This, all now concede. The *apostolic Canons* are *LXXXV ecclesiastical Laws*; and exhibit the principles of discipline received in the Greek and oriental churches, in the second and third centuries. The *VIII Books of apostolical Constitutions*, are the work of some austere and melancholy man, so bent upon that religious

&c., to which must be added the edition of Hen. Wotton, Cantab. 1718, 8vo, which is preferable to the preceding editions in many respects. [The English reader may find them both, together with some account of this author, in Abp. Wake's *Genuine epistles of the Apostolical Fathers*, translated, &c. An ample account of them is given by N. Lardner, *Credibility of the Gosp. history*, pt. ii. vol. i. p. 283, ed. Lond. 1815. *Tr.*—Neander says of Clement's two epistles, 'The first was read in the first centuries aloud at divine service in many churches, even with the writings of the New Testament. It contains an exhortation to unity, interwoven with examples and general reflections, addressed to the church at Corinth, which was shaken by divisions. This letter, although on the whole genuine, is nevertheless not free from important interpolations; e.g. a contradiction is apparent, since throughout the whole epistle, we perceive the simple relations of the earliest forms of a Christian church, as the bishops and presbyters are always put upon an equality, and yet in one passage (40, and following), the whole system of the Jewish priesthood is transferred to the Christian church. The second epistle, as it is called, is evidently only the fragment of a homily.'—Rose's *Neander*, Lond. 1841, ii. 332. *S.*]

¹ See J. B. Cotelier, *Patres Apostolici*, i. 133, 134, and Edw. Bernhard, *Adnotatiuncula ad Clementem*, in the last edition of the *Patres Apostol.* by J. le Clerc. These annotations H. Wotton has in vain attempted to confute, in his notes on the epistle of Clement.—[Besides the two epistles to the Corinthians, there are extant, in Syriac, two other epistles, ascribed to Clement, entitled, *de Virginitate, seu ad Virgines*. They were first brought to Europe by Sir James Porter, British ambassador at Constantinople, and published with a Latin translation by J. J. Wetstein, at the end of the 2nd vol. of his *Gr. N. Testament*, Lugd. Bat. 1752. Dr. N. Lardner assailed their genuine-

ness, in a *Diss.* of 60 pages, 8vo, Lond. 1753, and Herm. Venema followed, in three printed letters, 1754. Wetstein replied to the former; but dying in March 1754, he left the controversy with the latter, to Andrew Galland, who prosecuted it in his *Bibliotheca vet. Patrum*, Dissert. ii. cap. ii., also in Sprenger's *Thesaurus rei Patr.* i. 60, &c. These epistles are not mentioned by any writer till near the end of the fourth century. They were probably composed, in the oriental church, at the close of the second, or in the third century; and for the double purpose of recommending celibacy and reprehending the abuses of such a life. *Tr.*—The high antiquity of these epistles is in some degree testified by the non-appearance of any endeavour to support the pretensions of the hierarchical party; and by the circumstances, that the ideas of the priesthood belonging to the Old Testament are not here introduced into the Christian church, as is the case in similar writings of the kind; that neither the separation of the priesthood from the laity, nor the distinction of bishops and presbyters, occurs here; and that the gift of healing the sick, and especially demoniacs, is considered as a free gift, and not as a gift belonging to one peculiar office. And yet this is no certain proof of the high antiquity of the epistles; because, even if it were of later origin, all this might be explained from the idiosyncrasy of certain regions of the East.'—Rose's *Neander*, ii. 332. *S.*]

² For the history and various editions of these works, see Thom. Ittig, *Diss. de Patribus Apostol.*, prefixed to his *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostol.* and his *Diss. de Pseudepigraphis Apostol.*, annexed to his *Appendix ad librum de Hæresiarchis ævi Apostol.*—Also J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, l. v. cap. i. p. 31, &c., and l. vi. cap. i. p. 4, &c. [The best edition is that of Cotelier, republished by Le Clerc, 2 vols. fol. Amstel. 1724. *Tr.*]

reformation among Christians which he thought required by their defection from primitive purity and sanctity, that he did not hesitate to recommend his precepts by the names of the apostles, for the sake of insuring them a more ready approbation.¹ The *Recognitions of Clement*, which differ but little from the *Clementina*, are pleasing fables, composed by an Alexandrine Jew, who was also a philosopher, in the *third* century, to meet in a new manner the attacks of the Jews, Gnostics, and philosophers upon the Christian religion. A careful perusal of them will assist a person much in gaining a knowledge of the state of the ancient Christian church.²

§ 20. Among the *Apostolic Fathers*, as those writers are called, who conversed either with the apostles themselves, or with their immediate disciples, the next after *Clement* is *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch, a disciple and companion of the apostles. He suffered martyrdom under *Trajan*; being exposed to wild beasts, in the theatre at Rome.³ There are extant several epistles bearing his name; and concerning which the learned have had long and sharp contests. The *seven*, written while he was on his way to Rome, as published A. D. 1646, by *Is. Vossius*, from a Florentine MS., are accounted genuine; most writers reject the others as forged. To this opinion I cheerfully accede; and yet I must acknowledge that the genuineness of the *epistle to Polycarp*, on account of its difference in style, appears to me very dubious; and indeed the whole subject of the Ignatian epistles in general is involved in much obscurity and perplexity.⁴

¹ The various opinions of the learned respecting the *Apostolic Canons and Constitutions*, are collected by J. F. Buddeus, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, pt. ii. cap. v. p. 746. [See note on cent. iii. p. ii. c. 3, § 11. *Ed.*]

² See Mosheim's *Diss. de turbata per reventiores Platonicos Ecclesia*, in *Dissertt. ad historiam eccl. pertinentes*, i. § 34, p. 174, &c. [See note on cent. iii. pt. ii. c. 3, § 11. *Ed.*]

³ Tillemont, *Mémoires &c.* ii. pt. ii. p. 42, 80.

⁴ In regard to these epistles, consult J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. v. cap. i. p. 38—47. [Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 36, makes very honourable mention of Ignatius and his epistles; and describes his conduct while on his way to Rome, the place of his martyrdom. The account of his martyrdom, which is printed along with his epistles, gives a still fuller account of this eminent father. It is clear that he suffered death in the reign of Trajan; but whether A. D. 107, or 116, is uncertain. Rome was the place of his martyrdom, and wild beasts his executioners. On his way from Antioch, he was enraptured with his prospect of dying a martyr, and wrote probably all his epistles. Eusebius says: 'He confirmed the churches in every city through which he passed, by discourses and exhortations; warning them most especially to take heed of the heresies

which then first sprang up and increased.' From Smyrna (according to Eusebius) he wrote *four* of his epistles; namely, to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Rome. The last of these was to entreat the Roman Christians not to interpose and prevent his martyrdom. From Troas he wrote *three* other epistles; namely, to the churches of Philadelphia and of Smyrna, and to his friend Polycarp. Of these *seven* epistles, there are duplicate copies still extant; that is, copies of a larger and of a smaller size. The latter are those which many suppose to be genuine. Besides these, there are extant *five* other Greek epistles, and as many more in Latin; which are now universally rejected: namely, *ad Mariam Cassibolitam*, *ad Tarsenses*, *ad Antiochenos*, *ad Heronem Antiochenum diaconum*, *ad Philippenses*; also one in Latin, from the Virgin Mary to Ignatius, and his reply; two from Ignatius to St. John; and one of Maria Cassibolita to Ignatius. It is the singular fortune of the seven first epistles of Ignatius, to have become the subject of *sectarian* controversy among Protestants. In these epistles, the dignity and authority of *bishops* are exalted higher than in any other writings of this age. Hence, the strenuous advocates for the apostolic origin of episcopacy, prize and defend these epistles with no ordinary interest; while the reformed

§ 21. *Polycarp*, bishop of Smyrna, suffered martyrdom at an extreme age, in the middle of the second century. The epistle addressed to the Philippians, which is ascribed to him, is by some accounted genuine, and by others spurious; which of these are in the right, it is difficult to determine.¹ The *Epistle of Barnabas*, as it is called, was, in my judgment, the production of some Jewish Christian, who lived in this century, a man undoubtedly by no means bad, but possessed of little genius, and spoilt by Jewish fables. He was clearly a different person from *Barnabas*, the companion of *St. Paul*.² The *Shepherd of Hermas*, as it is called, because an *angel*, acting and appareled like a *shepherd*, plays the first part in it, was composed in the second century by *Hermas*, the brother of *Pius*, the Roman bishop.³ It seems to have been written by a man scarcely sane, since he has thought himself at liberty to invent conversations between God and the angels, for the sake of giving precepts which he considered salutary, a more ready entrance into the minds of his readers. But celestial spirits with him talk greater nonsense than hedgers and ditchers, or porters do among ourselves.⁴

divines, and especially those of Holland, France, and Switzerland, assail them with equal ardour. The most prominent champions are Bishop Pearson, in his *Vindiciæ epistolarum Ignatii*, Cantab. 1672, 4to, and John Daillé, *de Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur*, Genève, 1666, 4to. But each of these is supported by a host of able polemics. The truth is, that the external evidence or that from ancient testimony, makes much for the genuineness of these epistles, though equally for the larger as for the smaller. The internal evidence is divided, and of course affords ground for arguments on both sides. Moderate men of various sects, and especially Lutherans, are disposed to admit the genuineness of the epistles in their shorter form; but to regard them as interpolated and altered. An English translation of them and of the martyrdom of Ignatius, may be seen in archbishop Wake's *Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers*. Tr.—Among a great mass of very ancient MSS. purchased from an Egyptian monastery for the British Museum, which reached England in 1843, were Syriac versions of the Ignatian epistles to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans. These Mr. Cureton has published with an English translation and notes. They are less full than the Greek versions of these three epistles, but contain the passages from them found in Irenæus and Origen, the earliest authorities for the existence of any Ignatian remains. The questions, therefore, arise, Did Ignatius leave any epistles besides these three; and is not everything wanting in the Syriac version of them, an interpolation? S.—These doubts are satis-

factorily answered by R. Hussey, *Sermons*, Oxford, 1849, Pref.; by T. Chevallier, *Transl. Apost. Fathers*, p. xlix—liv., and J. J. Blunt, *Hist. Chr. Church*, London, 1861, pp. 243—247. 'Mr. Cureton's reasoning is generally rejected.'—Robertson, i. 14. Ed.]

¹ Concerning Polycarp and his epistle, see Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. ii. pt. ii. p. 287, and J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr. lib. v. cap. i. p. 47*. [Also W. Cave, *Life of Polycarp*, in his *Apostolici; or Lives of the Primitive Fathers*, Lond. 1677, fol. The epistle of Polycarp, and the epistle of the church of Smyrna, concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp, are given in English, in archbishop Wake's *Genuine Epistles, &c. Tr.*]

² Concerning *Barnabas*, see Tillemont, *Mémoires, &c. t. i. pt. iii. p. 1043*. Thom. Ittig, *Select. Historiæ ecclæ. capita*, sæc. i. cap. i. § 14, p. 20; and J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr. lib. iv. cap. v. § 14, p. 173*, and lib. v. cap. i. § 4, p. 3, and various others. [This epistle is likewise translated by archbishop Wake, *Genuine Epistles, &c. Tr.*—Modern criticism is favourable to the authenticity as well as genuineness of it. See Gieseler, i. 110. Ed.]

³ This is now manifest from the very ancient *Fragment of a Treatise on the Canon of the Holy Scriptures*, published a few years ago by Lud. Antony Muratori (from an ancient MS. found at Milan), in his *Antiq. Italicar. medii ævi*, tom. iii. diss. xliii. p. 853, &c. [Murdoch questions the value of this fragment; but there is no reasonable doubt of the genuineness of it. See Westcott on the Canon, 213, 235. Ed.]

⁴ [For the best edition of *Hermas*, we are indebted to J. A. Fabricius, who subjoined it to his *Codex Apocryph. N. T. t. iii.*

§ 22. None of those who gave their minds to writing while the Christian state was yet in its infancy, were powerful from learning, genius, or eloquence; but in their simple and unpolished manner, they express elevated piety.¹ And this is honourable, rather than reproachful, to the Christian cause. For, that a large part of the human race should have been drawn over to the worship of our Saviour by men of slender attainments and abilities, proves that the propagation of Christianity must be ascribed, not to human talents and appliances, but to the power of God.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES AND RELIGION.

§ 1. The nature and the standard of the Christian religion — § 2. Interpretation of the Scriptures — § 3. Mode of teaching Christianity — § 4. The Apostles' Creed — § 5. Distinction between catechumens and the faithful — § 6. Mode of instructing catechumens — § 7. Instruction of children; schools and academies — § 8. Secret doctrine — § 9. Lives and characters of Christians — § 10. Excommunication — § 11. Controversies among Christians — § 12. Contest about the terms of salvation — § 13. Judaizing Christians.

§ 1. THE whole Christian religion is comprehended in two parts; one of which teaches *what is to be believed* upon Divine subjects; the other, *how we ought to live*. The apostles ordinarily call the former *the mystery*, or *the truth*, the latter *godliness*.² The standard and rule of both are, those books which God dictated to certain individuals, chosen for the purpose, either before or after the birth of *Christ*.

He also treats of this writer, in his *Biblioth. Græca*, l. v. c. ix. § 9, p. 7. See also Thos. Ittig, *de Patribus Apostolicis*, § 55, p. 184, &c., and in his *Select. historia ecclæs. capita*, sæc. 1, p. 65, 155—179. The *Shepherd of Hermas* is translated by archbishop Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, &c., and though wild and fanciful, yet from the pious spirit which it breathes, and the insight it gives us into the speculations of the early Christians, it is not a useless book. *Tr.*]

¹ The writers above named, are denominated *the Apostolic Fathers*; and they are often published together. The best editions are by J. Bapt. Cotelier, Paris, 1672, re-edited by J. le Clerc. Antw. 1698, and again Amsterd. 1724, 2 vols. fol. with numerous notes by both the editors and others. [This last and best edition, Gr. and Lat., contains all that has been ascribed to the Apostolic Fathers, whether truly or falsely. The portions which archbishop Wake regarded as genuine, he translated and pub-

lished with a preliminary discourse of 136 pages, 2nd ed. Lond. 1710, 8vo. If any one wishes to know what was the *simplicity* and *godly sincerity* of that first and infantile age of the church, let him read the Apostolic Fathers. *Tr.* — ‘The difference between the writings of the apostles and those of the apostolical fathers, who are yet so close upon the former in point of time, is a remarkable phenomenon of its kind. While in other cases such a transition is usually quite gradual, in this case we find a sudden one. Here there is no gradual transition, but a sudden spring: a remark which is calculated to lead us to a recognition of the peculiar activity of the Divine Spirit in the souls of the apostles.’ Rose’s *Neander*, ii. 329. *S.* — The best edition is Jacobson’s, Oxford, 1847: the best translation, Chevalier’s, London, 1851. *Ed.*]

² τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως, 1 Tim. iii. 9. Κατ’ εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλία, vi. 3. Ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας τῆς κατ’ εὐσέβειαν, Tit. i. 1.

These books it has long been the custom to denominate *the Old and New Testaments*.

§ 2. Provision, therefore, was early made, both by the apostles and their disciples, that these books should be in the hands of all Christians; that they should be publicly read in their assemblies; and be applied as well to enlighten their minds with truth, as to advance them in piety. Those who expounded the Scriptures, studied simplicity and plainness. Yet it is not to be denied, that even in this century the perverse Jewish custom of obscuring the plain language of Scripture by forced and frigid allegories, and of diverting words from their natural and proper meanings, in order to extort from them some recondite senses, found admirers and imitators among Christians. Besides others, let *Barnabas*, whose epistle is yet extant, be a proof of this.

§ 3. The manner of teaching religious truths was perfectly simple, and remote from all the rules of the philosophers, and all the precepts of human art. This is manifest, not only from the epistles of the apostles, but also from all the monuments of this century which have come down to us. Nor did any apostle, or any one of their immediate disciples, collect and arrange the principal doctrines of Christianity in a scientific or regular *system*. The circumstances of the times did not require this; those who followed *Christ* had no other wish than to exhibit the religion that they had embraced by their turn of mind and way of life. They had no thought of recommending it by ingenious explanations and philosophic arrangements.

§ 4. There is indeed extant a brief summary of Christian doctrines, which is called the *Apostles' Creed*; and which, from the fourth century onward, was attributed to our Saviour's ambassadors themselves. But at this day, all who have any knowledge of antiquity, confess unanimously, that this opinion is a mistake, and has no foundation.¹ Those judge far more wisely and rationally, who think that this creed arose from small beginnings, and was gradually enlarged, as occasions required, in order to exclude new errors from the church.²

¹ See J. Fr. Buddeus, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, l. ii. c. ii. § ii. p. 441, and J. G. Walch, *Introduct. in libros symbolicos*, l. i. cap. ii. p. 87, &c.

² This is shown, with no less learning than ingenuity, by Peter King, *History of the Apostles' Creed*; translated into Latin, by G. Olearius, Lips. 1704, 8vo. But those who read this book should be apprised, that the noble author [he was eventually baron of Ockham, and lord chancellor. *S.*] often gives us conjectures instead of arguments; and that his conjectures do not always deserve to be implicitly received. [Although the Apostles' Creed was not composed in a council of apostles, as was supposed in the days of Rufinus (*Ruf. de Symbolo*; subjoined to Cypriani *Opera*), yet it appears to

have been the *general creed of the Christian church*, from, at least, the close of the *second* century, down to the Reformation. Nor did it undergo any very great or material change, as appears from comparing the formulæ of faith given by Irenæus, A.D. 175 (*adv. Hær.* i. 10, and iii. 4), and by Tertullian, A.D. 192 (*de Virgin. veland.* cap. i. — *contra Praxeam*, cap. ii. — *Præscript. adv. Hæret.* cap. xiii.), with the forms of the Creed, in all subsequent writers, down to the present time. See these forms, collected by C. G. F. Walch, in his *Bibliotheca symbolica vetus*, Lemgo, 1770, 8vo. Yet there were *some* variations in its form, as used by different churches; and *additions* were made to it from time to time. — Besides serving as the general test of Christian orthodoxy,

§ 5. At the first promulgation of the Gospel, *all* who professed firmly to believe that *Jesus* was the only Redeemer of mankind, and who promised to lead a holy life, conformably to the religion that he

the principal use of this creed, in the *third* and following centuries, was to guide catechists in training and instructing the catechumens in the principles of Christianity. See Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catechesis*, passim), Rufinus (*de Symbolo*), and Augustine (*Sermo I. ad Catechum.* Opp. vi. 399—405, ed. Benedict.). It is a most valuable monument of the church, because it shows what in the early ages were considered as the great, the peculiar, and the essential doctrines of the gospel; viz. those all-important *facts* which are summarily recounted in this Creed. The common form of it in the *fourth* century, as used in most churches in Europe, Asia, and Africa, except some slight verbal discrepancies, was the following:

Πιστεύω εἰς Θεὸν (πατέρα) παντοκράτορα· καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ (μονογεννητὸν), τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα, (καὶ) ταφέντα, (καὶ) τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν, ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς (καὶ) καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρίναι (κρίνειν) ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, καὶ εἰς (τὸ) Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν.

In Latin. Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Et in Christum Jesum, unicum filium ejus, Dominum nostrum; qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine; crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus. Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dextram Patris; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum; sanctam ecclesiam; remissionem peccatorum; carnis resurrectionem.

In English. I believe in God, the Father almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, buried, arose from the dead, on the third day ascended to the heavens, and sits on the right hand of the Father; whence he will come, to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit; the holy church; the remission of sins; and the resurrection of the body.

A few centuries later, it attained in the Roman church its ampler form, in which it has since been adopted by most protestant churches: as follows, — 'I believe in God the Father Almighty; Maker of heaven and earth: And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary, Suf-

fered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead, and buried, He descended into hell; The third day he rose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; The Holy Catholic Church; The Communion of Saints; The Forgiveness of sins; The resurrection of the body, And the life everlasting. Amen.'

Besides those mentioned by Mosheim, the principal writers on this creed are Cyril, Rufinus, and Augustine, as above; and G. J. Vossius (*de Tribus Symbolis*, Opp. vi. 507, &c.), Abp. Ussher (*de Rom. Eccles. aliisq. Fidei Symbolis*), Bp. Pearson (on the *Creed*), C. Suicer (*Thesaur. Eccles. voce Σύμβολον*), and J. Bingham, *Antiq. Eccl. lib. x.* — Tr. — Heurtley, *Collection of Creeds*, Oxf. 1858. *Ed.*]

[The *Apostles' Creed* is really the baptismal profession of the Roman church. All churches were called apostolical in which an apostle had personally taught for any length of time, especially if he had died there. The Roman was the only western church which could securely challenge this distinction. Hence the name given to its peculiar symbol. This was considered as an actual production of the apostles as early as the fifth century; an opinion which Valla and Erasmus were among the first to suspect, and which is now wholly exploded. The creed, indeed, though of very high antiquity and authority, is, taken as a whole, inferior in both respects to the Nicene Creed. (Waterland, *Works*, Oxf. 1823, ii. 196, v. 392.) The late Dr. Burton attributed a still higher antiquity to the tradition that this creed was really framed by the apostles: 'It is, perhaps, unnecessary to refute at any length the notion of what is called the *Apostles' Creed* being formed by each of the apostles contributing a sentence, or at least agreeing upon the whole. The idea is as old as the fourth century, and is not, therefore, to be treated as a modern superstition. Still, however, we could not admit the fact upon any principle of criticism or history; though there is positive evidence, that creeds were used in the second century; and though these creeds contain nearly all the clauses which are now found in the *Apostles' Creed*.' *Ecclesiastical History*, Oxf. 1845, p. 254. S. — For possible reasons why the creed, viewed as a watchword of the faithful, should not be committed to writing at this early period, see J. J. Blunt, *Hist. Chr. Ch.* p. 21—23. *Ed.*]

taught, were received immediately among the disciples of *Christ*. A more full instruction in the principles of Christianity did not *precede baptism*, but followed it. But afterwards, when churches were everywhere established and organised, for very just reasons this custom was changed; and none were admitted to the sacred font, unless previously well instructed in the primary truths of religion, and affording indubitable evidence of a sincere and holy character. Hence arose the distinction between *catechumens*, or such as were in a course of instruction and discipline under the care of certain persons, and the *faithful*, who were admitted to all the mysteries, having been initiated and consecrated by baptism.¹

§ 6. The instruction given to the catechumens was different, according to their genius and capacity. For those of feeble minds were instructed only in the more general and fundamental principles of religion: while those who appeared capable of comprehending all Christian knowledge, were instructed in everything that could render a Christian stable and perfect according to the views of that age. The business of instructing those of superior capacity and genius was committed to men of gravity and erudition in the larger churches. Hence the ancient doctors generally divide their flocks into two classes of persons, the one comprising such as received solid and thorough instruction, the other embracing the more ignorant. Nor do they conceal the fact, that different modes of teaching were adopted in reference to these two classes.²

§ 7. There is no doubt, but that the children of Christians were carefully trained up from their infancy, and were early put to reading the sacred books and learning the principles of religion. For this purpose, *schools* were erected everywhere, from the beginning. From these schools for children, we must distinguish those *seminaries* of the early Christians, erected extensively in the larger cities, at which adults, and especially such as aspired to be public teachers, were instructed and educated, in all branches of learning, both human and divine. Such seminaries, in which young men devoted to the sacred office, were taught whatever was necessary to qualify them properly for it, the apostles of *Christ* undoubtedly both set up themselves, and directed others to set up.³ St. *John* at Ephesus, and *Polycarp* at Smyrna, established such schools.⁴ Among these seminaries, no one

¹ [See J. Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* lib. iii. cap. iv. and Tob. Pfanner, *de Catechumenis veterum*, Vinariæ, 1688, 12mo. Tr.]

² [See Origen, *adv. Celsum*, lib. iii. p. 143. The apostles themselves seem to have been the authors of this practice, of which we have vestiges, 1 *Cor.* iii. 2, *Heb.* v. 12. *Schl.*]

³ 2 *Tim.* ii. 2.

⁴ Irenæus, *adv. Hær.* l. ii. c. 22, p. 148, ed. Massuet. Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 20. [The proofs referred to here and in the text, are quite insufficient to show, that in the first century, or even in the former part of the second, Christians established regular schools for their children, and academies for

their young men. Paul's direction to Timothy (2 *Ep.* ii. 2), 'The things thou hast heard of me — the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also;' seems to have no distinct reference to a regular public school, either for boys or for young men. And the passages in Irenæus and Eusebius referred to, speak only of the general instruction and advantages, which the neighbouring clergy and others derived from the apostle John; and of the interesting conversations of Polycarp. Considering the poverty and embarrassments of the first Christians, we can hardly suppose they could have

was more celebrated eventually than that at Alexandria, which is commonly called a *catechetical school*, and was instituted, people say, by St. Mark himself.¹

§ 8. What many tell us, that the earlier Christians had some sort of *secret discipline*,² that is, did not communicate to all the same instructions, may be admitted as true, if it be but rightly understood. Unquestionably those whom they would bring to *Christ*, were not introduced at once to the high mysteries of religion which exceed the grasp of the human mind, but were first only taught such doctrines as mere reason readily admits, till they were able to bear those that are more sublime and difficult. And afterwards, even individuals who now ranked among believers were not all instructed in the same manner; but one was directed to study and treasure up in his mind more, or fewer things, than another. Whoever would understand more than this, by the *secret discipline* of the first century, should beware, lest he confound the faults of subsequent ages with the excellences of this.³

§ 9. Most authors represent the lives and morals of Christians in this age, as patterns of purity and holiness, worthy of the imitation of all subsequent ages. This representation, if it be understood of the *greater part* of the professed Christians, and not of *all*, is undoubtedly true. But whoever supposes the primitive churches to have been

erected such schools and academies. And from the great penury of writers, and of learned men of any sort, in the early church — Justin Martyr, a converted philosopher in the middle of the second century, being the first learned writer after the apostles; — it seems most probable, that till past the middle of the *second* century, the means of education among Christians were very slender; and by no means so general and so ample as Mosheim supposes. *Tr.*

¹ J. A. Schmidt, *Diss. de schola catechet. Alexandr.* prefixed to the tract of A. Hyperius, *de Catechesi*; also Dom. Aulsius, *delle Scuole sacre*, lib. ii. c. i. ii. p. 5—17, and c. xxi. p. 92, &c. Concerning the larger schools of Christians in the East, at Edessa, Nisibis, Seleucia; and concerning the ancient Christian schools in general; see J. S. Asseman, *Biblioth. orient. Clem. Vat.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 914—919. [Dr. Murdock doubts the ancient tradition, preserved by Jerome (*de Scriptor. Illustr.* cap. 36), that St. Mark was the founder of the catechetical school at Alexandria, or that there was a Christian school there till the days of Pantenus, and his pupil Clemens Alex. near the close of the *second* century. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, iii. 188, &c. But see Burton, *Eccl. Hist.* p. 433. *Ed.*]

² *Disciplina quædam arcani*. [The author evidently meant his readers to observe, that there is no occasion for admitting an

identity between the secret instructions of the first century, and such as arose out of them at a subsequent period. Justin Martyr is thought to allude to a species of *Disciplina arcani*, but it does not appear with any clearness, before Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria. *S.*]

³ Concerning this *secret doctrine*, much is collected by Chr. Matt. Pfaff, *Diss. posterior de præjudiciis theolog.* § 13, p. 149, &c. in his *Primitiæ Tubingenses*. [There is much valuable matter on the *Disciplina Arcani*, in the second century, to be found in Mosheim, *de Rebb. Chr. &c.* 303. The English reader may consult advantageously on this curious subject, Mr. Faber's *Difficulties of Romanism*, p. 95. Romanists have naturally availed themselves of this peculiarity in the early Christian system to account for the want of ancient testimonies in favour of transubstantiation. But Mr. Faber has shown from Cyril of Jerusalem, that the Trinity was the chief object in this secret discipline. There were, however, other objects, and the sacraments among them: some of them, as the approaching fall of the Roman power, demanded concealment on political grounds. But whatever might be the origin of this discipline, its eventual importance undoubtedly arose from a wish to naturalise among Christians something analogous to the mysteries about which their pagan neighbours talked so much. *S.*]

perfectly free from vices and sins, and estimates the lives of *all* the Christians by the conduct of some among them, and by the precepts and exhortations of their teachers, as is generally done by writers of books and tracts on the innocence and holiness of the early Christians, may be confuted by the clearest evidence of both testimony and facts.¹

§ 10. External sanctity was carefully guarded in the Christian commonwealth by a regulation which deprived of religious ordinances, and expelled from the community, such as were discreditable and polluted by the grosser vices, if, on admonition, they would not return to better courses. For this, authority was unquestionably given by Christ's apostles at the very beginning of his kingdom.² It was a regulation, in enforcing which all took a share; the teachers and rulers generally pointed out individuals deemed unworthy of sacred rites, but the people freely either approved or repudiated their judgment. Excluded sinners, although they had committed even the greatest offences, if they gave satisfactory evidence of true repentance for their faults, and of an entrance upon a better course of life, were allowed to return to the church, at least in most places; yet but once only. For if such as had been restored went back again to their former sinful habits, and were thrust from the brotherhood once more, they lost all prospect of forgiveness.³

§ 11. As the Christian churches were composed of both Jews and Gentiles, between whom there had been an inveterate aversion, and as the new converts brought no small number of erroneous opinions imbibed in their tender years, it could not be but that various disagreements and contests would early arise among them. The first of these controversies related to the necessity of observing the law of *Moses*. It broke out in the church of Antioch; and its issue is stated by Luke.⁴ This dispute was followed by many others; at one time with Jews, fond above measure of their ancestral religion; at another, with such as admired a fanatical kind of philosophy; at another, with some who abused the Christian doc-

¹ [For a knowledge of the state of piety and morals among the Christians of the first century, we are dependent nearly altogether on the Holy Scriptures; for all the apostolic fathers, except Clement, lived and wrote in the second century. Clement wrote upon occasion of a broil in the church of Corinth; and he aims to set home Paul's exhortations to them on former occasions. From the N. T., and especially from Paul's epistles, we learn many things respecting the state of morals and piety among Christians, from the first planting of the churches till about A. D. 68. And from the Apocalyptical epistles, we learn the state of religion in the seven churches of Asia, about A. D. 96. Judging from these representations, it would seem that the characters of the Christians of that age presented a singular combination of excellences and defects; that, in some re-

spects, they were indeed patterns for all after-ages; but, in other respects, and especially certain churches, as Corinth, Galatia, Sardis, and Laodicea, by no means deserved imitation. *Tr.*]

² [See 1 Cor. v.] For the discussions that have taken place respecting this *law*, see Chr. Matt. Pfaff, *de Originibus juris ecclesiast.* p. 10—13, 71, 78.

³ See Jo. Morin, *Commentar. de disciplina pœnitentie*, lib. ix. cap. 19, p. 670, and others. [Natal. Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. N. T. sæc. iii. diss. vii.*; and J. Aug. Orsi, *Diss. qua ostenditur, cathol. ecclesiam tribus prior. sæculis capital. crim. reis pacem et absolut. neuitiquam denegasse*; Milan, 1730, 4to. But all these writers describe rather the practice of the second and third centuries than that of the first. *Tr.*]

⁴ Acts xv.

trines, which they ill understood, to the gratification of their vices and appetites.¹ St. Paul and the other apostles often mention these controversies, but so cursorily and concisely, that we can hardly ascertain the exact points controverted.

§ 12. Of all these contests, the greatest and most important seems to have been that upon the means of attaining to justification and salvation, which Jewish teachers excited at Rome and in other Christian churches. For while the apostles everywhere inculcated, that every hope of obtaining justification and salvation must be placed solely in *Jesus Christ*, and his merits; these Jewish teachers ascribed to the law, and to the works which it enjoined, the chief influence in procuring everlasting happiness. This error not only led on to many others, which were prejudicial to the religion of *Christ*, but also it was connected with the highest dishonour to the Saviour. For they who maintained that a life regulated according to the law, would give a title to eternal rewards, could not consider *Christ* as the true Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind; but merely as a prophet, or a divine messenger among men. It cannot therefore appear at all strange that St. Paul, in his *Epistle to the Romans* and elsewhere, took so much pains to extirpate this capital error.

§ 13. The controversy respecting the necessity of the Mosaic rites in order to salvation, was wisely decided by the apostles.² But great as the apostolic influence was, that inbred love of the law which Moses enacted, and their fathers handed down, could not be wholly eradicated from the minds of the Jewish Christians, and especially of those who lived in Palestine. It diminished a little after Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans, and the temple ruined; yet it did not wholly subside. Hence it was, as we shall see hereafter, that a part of the Jewish Christians separated from the other brethren, and formed a distinct sect from adherents to the Mosaic law.

¹ Conducive to the illustration of these controversies are the investigations of Herm. Witsius, *Miscellanea sacra*, t. ii. exerc. xx. xxi. xxii. p. 668, &c. Camp. Vitringa, *Observatt. Sacrae*, lib. iv. c. ix. x. xi. p. 952.

[J. F. Buddeus, *Ecclesia Apostolica*; and especially, Ch. W. Fr. Walch, *Vollständige Historie der Ketzereyen, Spaltungen, u. s. w.* i. 68, &c.; also the Commentators on the Scriptures. *Tr.*]

² Acts xv.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES AND CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Baptism and the Lord's Supper appointed by Christ — § 2. Rites instituted by the apostles — § 3. The Jewish rites retained — § 4. Public assemblies of Christians, and times for meeting — § 5. Places of meeting — § 6. Mode of worship — § 7. Lord's Supper and *agapæ* — § 8. Baptism — § 9. Anointing the sick — § 10. Fasting.

§ 1. **ALTHOUGH** the Christian religion has the greatest simplicity, and requires nothing but faith and love; yet it could not wholly dispense with external rites and institutions. Jesus himself established only *two* ceremonies, which it is not lawful either to change or to abrogate; namely, *baptism* and the *Lord's supper*. He did not, however, mean them as naked forms, or to be merely significant, but also to have the power of changing men's minds. From his pleasure to establish no more, we should infer, that ceremonies are not essential to his religion, and that this business has been committed by him to the discretion and free choice of Christians.

§ 2. Many considerations leave us no reason to doubt, that the friends and apostles of the Saviour sanctioned in various places the use of other rites; which they either tolerated from necessity, or recommended for good and solid reasons. Yet we are not to suppose that they anywhere laid down some system of pontifical jurisprudence to be always ready, and never-ending; or that the same institutions were prescribed to all Christian societies. On the contrary, various things go to show, that Christian worship was from the beginning regulated and conducted differently in different places; unquestionably under authority of the apostles, their friends, and disciples; and that in this matter, much regard was paid to the ancient opinions, customs, and laws of the several nations.¹

¹ [It appears that even so late as the third and fourth centuries, there was considerable difference in the mode of conducting religious worship among Christians. See Irenæus, quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 24. Sozomen, *H. E.* vii. 19. Socrates, *H. E.* v. 22. Augustine, *Ep.* 54, Opp. ii. 93. A part of this difference in rites and ceremonies appears to have come down from the apostolic times. For when a contest arose in the second century, between the eastern and western Christians, respecting Easter, we are informed by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 23, 24), that the former maintained, that John was the author of their custom; and the latter, that Peter and Paul were the authors of theirs. Both churches were probably correct: for it is very probable

that John, for certain reasons, did ordain in Asia, that the feast of Easter should be kept at the time the Jews kept it, and that Peter and Paul ordered otherwise at Rome. Further, the Greek and Latin churches had a contest on the question, whether *leavened* or *unleavened* bread should be used in the sacred supper. And both churches claimed to have their customs handed down to them from the apostles; and for the reasons before mentioned, both were probably in the right. — Even the Catholics often admit this diversity of ceremonies in the apostolic church; e. g. Jo. Bona, *Rerum Liturg.* l. i. c. 7, § 2, Opp. p. 208; and the Jesuit, Jo. Harduin, makes no scruple to assert, that Paul enjoined on the Greeks *one* form for the conse-

§ 3. I am therefore induced to dissent from those who think that the Jewish rites and forms were *everywhere* transferred by the apostles and their disciples to the Christian assemblies. In those churches, indeed, which were composed either wholly or principally of Jews, I can easily believe the Jewish rites to have been so far retained as the different characters of the two religions would permit. And this may be confirmed by a good many examples. But that the same took place in other churches, in which either no Jews or only a few were found, is not merely uncertain, but also incredible. Different religious regulations were, in fact, necessary for those early times, in order to suit the peculiarities of genius and character in different nations.

§ 4. Since the discipline of Christians was various, it is very difficult to form such notions upon the form of their public worship, with others of their customs and institutions, as will be equally applicable to *all* the countries in which Christianity flourished. Yet there are a few regulations which may be considered as common to all Christians; and of these we shall give a brief account.—The Christians in this century assembled for the worship of God, and for their advancement in piety, on the *first day of the week*, the day on which *Christ* rose from the dead; for that this day was set apart for religious worship by the apostles themselves, and that, after the example of the church of Jerusalem, it was generally observed, we have unexceptionable testimony.¹ Moreover, those congregations, which either lived among Jews, or were composed in a great measure of Jews, were accustomed also to observe the *seventh day* of the week as a sacred day:² for doing which, the other Christians taxed them with no wrong. As to *annual* religious days, they appear to have observed *two*; the one in memory of *Christ's* resurrection; the other in commemoration of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles.³ To these may be added those days on which holy men met death for *Christ's* sake; which, it is most probable, were sacred and solemn days from the very commencement of the Christian church.⁴

eration of priests; and Peter, on the Romans, another. *La dissertation du P. le Courayer, sur la succession des Evesques Anglois et sur la validité de leur ordination, réfutée*, ii. 13, Paris, 1725, 8vo. Tr.—Add A. Krazer, *de Apostolicis, nec non antiquis eocl. occident. Liturgiis*, sec. i. cap. i. § 2, p. 3, ed. Augustæ Vind. 1786. See Mosheim's *Institut. majores hist. Christ.* p. 375. Schl.]

¹ Ph. J. Hartmann, *de Rebus gestis Christianor. sub Apostolis*, c. xv. p. 387. J. Hen. Böhmer, *Diss. I. juris eocl. antiqui de stato die Christianor.* p. 20, &c. [See also Acts xx. 7; ii. 1. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. Rev. i. 10. Pliny, *Epist.* lib. x. ep. 97, n. 7. Schl.]

² Steph. Curcellæus, *Diatriba de esu sanguinis*; Opp. Theol. p. 958. Gabr. Alaspiniæus, *Observatt. Eccles.* lib. i. obs. xiii. p. 53. In vain, some learned men labour to persuade us, that in *all* the early churches, *both* days, or the *first* and *last* days of the week, were

held sacred. The churches of Bithynia, mentioned by Pliny, devoted but *one stated day* to their public worship: and beyond all controversy, that was what we call the *Lord's day*, or the first day of the week.

³ Although some have doubted whether the day called *Pentecost* (*Whit-Sunday*) was a sacred day, so early as the first century, (Bingham, *Origines Eccles.* l. xx. c. 6), yet I am induced, by very weighty reasons, to believe, that from the beginning it was held equally sacred with the *Passover* (or *Easter day*). Perhaps also *Friday*, as the day on which our Saviour died, was, from the earliest times, regarded with more respect than other days of the week. See J. Godefroi, in *Codicem Theodos.* i. 138. Asseman, *Biblioth. orient. Vatican.* i. 217, 237. Martene, *Thesaur. Anecdotor.* v. 66.

⁴ [These were called *natalitia martyrum* (the *martyrs' birth-days*). See Casp. Sagit-

§ 5. The *places* of assembling were, undoubtedly, the private houses of Christians. But as necessity required, when a congregation was formed and duly regulated, that some fixed, uniform place should be designated for its meetings, and as some furniture was requisite for holding them, such as books, tables, and benches, which could not conveniently be transported from one situation to another, especially in those times, undoubtedly the consequence was, that these places soon became, instead of private rooms, in a manner, public ones.¹ These few remarks, I conceive, are sufficient to determine that long controversy, *whether the early Christians had temples or not?*² If the word *temple* may denote a *dwelling-house*, or even a part of one, devoted to the public exercises of religion, yet neither with any idea of holiness attached to it, nor separated from every profane use, then I can readily admit that the earliest Christians had temples.

§ 6. In these public assemblies of Christians, the Holy Scriptures were read, which, for that purpose, were divided into certain portions. Then followed an exhortation to the people, neither eloquent nor long, but full of warmth and love. If any declared themselves under the Spirit's influence, they were allowed successively to state what the Lord commanded; the other *prophets* who were present judging how much authority was due to them.³ Afterwards, the prayers, which constituted no inconsiderable part of public worship, were repeated after the bishop.⁴ To these succeeded hymns, which were

tarius, *de Natalitiis martyrum*, republished by Crenius, *Syntagma i. Diss. philol.* 1699. In the second century, these *natalitia* were everywhere observed; and they are often mentioned by Tertullian and Cyprian. Nay, in the epistle of the church of Smyrna to Philomelium, in Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 15, the observance of the day of Polycarp's martyrdom is spoken of. *Schl.*]

¹ Vitringa, *de Synagoga vetere*, l. i. pt. iii. cap. 1, p. 432. [It may be inferred from Acts xix. 8, 1 Cor. xi. 22, xiv. 35, and Ja. ii. 2, that Christians then had certain determinate places for holding public worship. *Schl.*]

² See Dav. Blondell, *de Episcopis et Presbyt.* sect. iii. p. 216, 243, 246; Just. Hen. Böhmer, *Diss. ii. Juris eccles. antiq. de antelucanis Christianorum catibus*, § iv. p. 39; Jos. Bingham, *Origines Eccles.* l. viii. c. i. and others.

³ 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

⁴ See Justin Martyr, *Apologia secunda*, p. 98, &c. [Bp. Kaye thus gives Justin's account: 'And on the day called Sunday' (τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ), 'there is an assembling together of all who dwell in the cities and country; and the memoirs of the apostles, and the writings of the prophets, are read as long as circumstances permit. Then, when the reader has ceased, the president' (ὁ προεστὼς) 'delivers a discourse, in which he admonishes and exhorts

(all present) to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray' (εὐχὰς πέμπομεν), 'and as we before said' (in describing the service after a baptism), 'prayer being ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president' (ὁ προεστὼς) 'offers prayers in like manner, and thanksgivings according to his ability' (εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει), 'and the people express their assent by saying *Amen*; and the distribution of that over which the thanksgiving has been pronounced, takes place to each; and each partakes, and a portion is sent to the absent by the deacons. And they who are wealthy, and choose, give as much as they respectively deem fit; and whatever is collected' (τὸ συλλεγόμενον) 'is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us; and, in a word, takes care of all who are most in need.' (Some account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr, Camb. 1829, p. 89.)—This very interesting statement really relates to the former half of the second century; but Mosheim is probably right in considering it applicable to the first also. The term *προεστὼς*, Bingham considers identical with *bishop*, which appears to be the fact (*Antiqq.* II. ii. 9); but Justin so uses it, in his account of the service after a baptism (p. 96, ed. Thirlby), as

sung, not by the whole assembly, but by certain persons, during the celebration of the sacred supper and the feasts of charity. The precise order and manner of performing all these parts of religious worship in the various Christian churches, cannot be fully ascertained; yet it is most probable that no one of them was wholly omitted in any church.¹

§ 7. The prayers of Christians were followed by *oblations* of bread, wine, and other things, from which provision was made both for the ministers of the church and the poor. Now every Christian who had anything to spare, brought his present, and offered it in a sense to the Lord.² From these gifts, so much bread and wine as were requisite for the Lord's supper were set apart, and consecrated by certain prayers, which the bishop alone poured forth, the people responding *Amen*.³ The distributors of the sacred supper were the *deacons*. To this most holy ordinance were annexed the sober meals, which, from the object of their institution, were called *agapæ*.⁴ The various difficulties which occur in accounts of these feasts will undoubtedly embarrass none who bear in mind that the earliest Christians were governed by different rules, and did not manage everywhere alike either these, or any other of their institutions.

§ 8. In this century *baptism* was administered, in convenient places, without the public assemblies; and by immersing the candidates wholly in water.⁵ At first, all who were engaged in propagating Christianity, administered this rite: nor can it be called in question, that whoever persuaded any person to embrace Chris-

to furnish, perhaps, with a handle, such as would make the *president* not differ in order from the rest of the congregation. In describing the service after a baptism, he says, 'Bread is then brought to that brother who presides, and a cup of wine, mixed with water.' (Bp. Kaye's transl.) *προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κρέματος*. It might, perhaps, be rendered, *to him who presides over the brethren*, which would suggest no suspicion of identity in order with the congregation generally. But whatever might be the president's general relation to the rest of the brethren, it is clear that from him proceeded the prayers and thanksgivings which converted, according to Justin, the bread and wine, from common bread and drink, into the body and blood of Christ. He also preached, after the lessons had been read, and acted as the congregation's almoner. But it does not appear that the bread and wine were taken, as they were subsequently, from the offerings then made by the congregation, or that anything was given until the service was over. A collection, therefore, not an offertory, seems to have been the primitive practice. The collection, too, appears to have been wholly for the poor. It may be also worth observing, that nothing

is said of any particular class or person to read the introductory lessons, or to conduct the prayers before the Eucharist. *S.*—Blunt thinks that the use of the hymn *Ter Sanctus*, in the Eucharistic service, is glanced at by Clement of Rome, *Ep. i.* § 34. *Hist. Chr. Ch. p. 33. Ed.]*

¹ This must be understood of the churches that were fully established and regulated. For in the nascent churches, which had not become duly regulated, I can believe one or other of these exercises might be omitted.

² See Christ. Matt. Pfaff, *Dissertt. de oblatione et consecratione Eucharistica*; in his *Syntagma Dissertt. Theolog.* Stutgard. 1720, 8vo.

³ Justin Martyr, *Apologia secunda*, p. 98, &c. The writers on the ceremonies of the sacred supper are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliograph. Antiquaria*, cap. xi. p. 395, &c.

⁴ Feasts of charity. The writers concerning the *agapæ*, are mentioned by Tho. Ittig, *Select. histor. eccles. capita*, sæcul. ii. cap. iii. p. 180, &c.; and Christ. Matt. Pfaff, *de Originibus juris eccles.* p. 68.

⁵ See Ger. Jo. Vossius, *de Baptismo*, disp. i. Thes. vi. p. 31, &c. and the authors recommended by J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* cap. xi. § xxv. p. 389, &c.

tianity, could baptize his own disciple. But when Christian bodies became settled, and were provided with fixed regulations, the *bishop* alone exercised the right of bathing new converts in the sacred font. But as the limits of his church embraced greater numbers and a wider district, he imparted this right to the *presbyters* and *chor-episcopi*; reserving, however, to himself the *confirmation* of baptism administered by a presbyter.¹ As to ceremonies, added to baptism, at this period, for the sake of order and decency, we have no means of saying anything certain and solid. And we do not think it safe to lay down rules for the first age from the customs of subsequent times.

§ 9. Those who laboured under severe illness, sent for the rulers of the church,² according to the apostolic precept,³ who, after the sick man had confessed his sins, commended his case to God in devout supplication, and anointed him with oil. Many things in regard to this rite may be, and have actually been, subjects of controversy. But the silence of the ancient writers prevents us from coming to any certain conclusions. It is, in fact, a matter seldom mentioned in monuments of early times, although its universal prevalence can be no wise doubted.⁴

§ 10. No law was enacted by *Christ* and his apostles concerning *fasts*; but it became the custom with most Christians, as individuals, to join occasionally abstinence from food with their prayers, especially when engaged in an undertaking of more than usual importance.⁵ The length of time to be bestowed upon this duty was a matter left to the parties themselves: nor did a person lower his character at all, if he thought it sufficient for *him* to observe only the rules of strict temperance.⁶ Of any solemn *public* fasts, except only on the anniversary day of *Christ's* crucifixion, there is no mention in the most ancient times. Gradually, however, stated days of fasting were introduced; first by custom, afterwards by legal sanction. Whether anything of this nature occurred in the *first* century, and what days were devoted to fasting, we have not the means of deciding. And yet I would not deny that powerful arguments are adduced by those who think, that while the apostles were still living, or soon after their decease, the Christians in most places abstained from food, either wholly or partially, on the fourth and sixth days of the week.⁷

¹ These remarks, I conceive, go to elucidate and determine the questions so strenuously debated among the learned, concerning the *right of administering baptism*. See Just. Hen. Böhmer, *Diss. xi. Juris eccles. antiqui*, p. 500, &c. Jo. Le Clerc, *Biblioth. universelle et historique*, iv. 93, &c.

² *Præfecti ecclesiæ*.

³ James v. 14.

⁴ Most of the ancient testimonies concerning this custom are collected by Jo. Launoï, *de Sacramento unctionis infirmorum*, c. i. p. 444, Opp. t. i. Among these passages, very few are to be found in the writers of the *first* centuries; yet there is here and there one which has escaped the

notice of this very learned man. [The principal writers on this subject are mentioned by J. C. Wolf, *Cursæ philol. et crit. t. iv. on Ja. v. 14. Tr.*]

⁵ 1 Cor. vii. 5.

⁶ Shepherd of Hermas, lib. iii. similit. v. p. 931, 935, ed. Fabricii, at the close of vol. iii. of his *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* [The best writer on this subject is John Daillé, *de Jejuniis et Quadragesima*, Davent. 1654, 8vo., against whom, however, Beveridge brings some objections, in *Codex Canon. vind. Schl.*]

⁷ See Will. Beveridge, *Codex Canon. vindic. t. ii. Patr. Apostol.* p. 166.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SEPARATIONS OR HERESIES.

§ 1. Sects sprung up in the very time of the apostles — § 2. They gradually increased — § 3. Sect of the Gnostics — § 4. It originated from the oriental philosophy — § 5. They occasioned various errors in regard to the holy Scriptures, and other subjects — § 6. Gnostic opinions concerning *Christ* — § 7. Their moral doctrines — § 8. How they supported their doctrines — § 9. Causes of disagreement among themselves — § 10. Dositheus — § 11. Simon Magus was not a *heretic* — § 12. His history — § 13. His doctrines — § 14. Menander — § 15. Whether there was a sect of Nicolaitans — § 16. Cerinthus and the Cerinthians — § 17. Nazarenes and Ebionites properly belong to the second century.

§ 1. CHRISTIAN societies were scarcely formed, and in a manner organised, when at once there were men everywhere, who, little contented with the simplicity and purity of that religion which the apostles taught, attempted innovations, and of their own heads wanted to fashion a religion for themselves. This appears from various passages in the epistles left us by the apostles, and particularly from *Paul's*. For in these there is frequent mention of persons, who either endeavoured to mould the Christian doctrines into conformity with that philosophy, or *γνῶσις*,¹ to which they were addicted; or who were disposed to combine with Christianity Jewish opinions, customs, and institutions. Several of these corrupters of religion are likewise expressly named; as *Hymenæus* and *Alexander*, *Philetus*, *Hermogenes*, *Phygellus*, *Demas*, and *Diotrephes*.² If, however, from this list, *Alexander*, *Hymenæus*, and *Philetus*, be excepted, the others appear chargeable rather with dereliction of duty than corruption of religion.³

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 20; and ch. i. 3, 4. Tit. iii. 9. Colos. ii. 8.

² [Concerning Diotrephes, there is a particular tract, by Stemler, 1758. *Schl.*]

³ 2 Tim. ii. 18, and elsewhere. See also the elaborate discussions concerning these men, by Vitranga, *Observ. Sacræ*, l. iv. c. ix. p. 952. Thomas Ittig, *de Hæresiarchis ævi apostol.* sect. i. cap. viii. p. 84. J. Fr. Buddeus, *de Ecclesia Apostolica*, cap. v. p. 292, &c.—[As to Hymenæus and Philetus (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, comp. 1 Tim. i. 19, 20), their particular error is pointed out. They taught, that a resurrection of the dead was no longer to be anticipated, it being already passed; and they laboured to make proselytes to this opinion. See J. G. Walch, *Exercitat. de Hymenæo et Phileto*, in his *Miscell. Sacra*, p. 81, &c.—As to Alexander, it is still con-

tested whether the Alexander in 1 Tim. i. 20; and 2 Tim. iv. 14; and Acts ix. 33, be one and the same person. Heumann (*Expos. of the N. T.* vi. 363) and Dr. Mosheim (*Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 178) support the negative; being inclined to believe that there were two persons of this name. The younger Walch (*Entwurf der Ketzereyen*, p. 127) prefers abiding by the common and affirmative opinion. Hermogenes and Phygellus are accused by Paul, 2 Tim. i. 15, of only having forsaken *him* when he was imprisoned at Rome, which was *inconstancy*, but not *heresy*. The fault of Demas (2 Tim. iv. 10), the love of the world, and the offence of Diotrephes, a personal opposition to St. John, are not enough to constitute heresy. *Schl.*]

§ 2. So long as most of our Saviour's personal friends were alive, these men had but moderate success, and seem to have collected no great number of followers. But gradually they acquired more influence; and before the decease of all those whom *Christ* had himself instructed, they laid the foundations of those sects, which afterwards exceedingly disturbed the Christian community, and gave rise to so many contests. The history of these sects is very obscure; indeed, the most obscure part of ecclesiastical history. This obscurity arises, partly from the deficiency of ancient records, partly from the very tenets of these sects, which for the most part were singularly cloudy and remote from common apprehension, and partly from the ignorance and hostility of those who have written concerning them. This, however, is perfectly clear, that no one who loves the truths which the Bible inculcates can find anything to commend in the peculiarities of these sects.¹

§ 3. At the head of all the sects which disturbed the peace of the church stand the Gnostics, who claimed ability to restore to mankind the lost knowledge (*γνῶσις*) of the true and supreme God, and who announced the overthrow of that empire which the Creator of the world and his associates had set up. It is, indeed, the common opinion, and supported by the testimony of Clemens Alexandrinus,² that the Gnostic sect first arose, *after the decease of the apostles*, in the reign of *Adrian*; and that previously no discords had produced separations from the church. But the sacred Scriptures themselves—to say nothing of other ancient documents—put it beyond controversy, that even in the *first* century, in various places, men infected with the Gnostic leprosy began to erect societies distinct from the other Christians.³ Yet these stray flocks did not become

¹ Professed histories of the sects which arose in this and the next century, have been written by Thom. Ittig, *de Hæresiarchis ævi apostolici et apostolico proximi*, Lips. 1690, 4to, and Appendix, Lips. 1696, 4to; by Renatus Massuetus, *Dissertt. Irenæo præmissæ*; and by Sebast. le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*. But all these, and others whom I pass over, have rather collected *materials* for a history of these sects than written the history itself. Among the Lutherans, Abr. Hinckelmann, Ja. Thomasius, Jo. Hen. Horbius, and among the Reformed, Ja. Basnage and Henry Dodwell, have either promised the world such a history or attempted to write it, but have done no more. We must therefore still wait for some person of adequate sagacity, fairness, and skill in ancient philosophy and literature, to accomplish this difficult undertaking. [This has been since attempted by C. W. F. Walch, *Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Ketzerereyen*, &c. 11 vols. 8vo, 1762—85. N. Lardner, *Hist. of the Heretics*, Lond. 1780, 4to. F. A. Lewald, *de Doctrina Gnostica*,

Heidelb. 1818, 8vo. A. Neander, *Genetische Entwicklung d. vornehmsten gnost. Systeme*, Berlin, 1818, 8vo.; and still better, in his *Allgem. Gesch. der chr. Relig. u. Kirche*, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 602—859. *Tr.*—The English reader will do well to consult upon this subject, Dr. Burton's *Inquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age*, being the Bampton Lectures for 1829. *S.*]

² *Stromatt.* l. vii. c. 17, pp. 898, 899.

³ 1 John ii. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 20. Col. ii. 8. [The reader will recollect, that Dr. Mosheim's opinions, concerning an oriental philosophy in the apostolic age, have been much questioned (see Note on cent. i. pt. ii. c. i. § 5); and that these texts, which speak only of false *teachers* who corrupted the truth, afforded no certain evidence of the existence of Gnostic churches or congregations, existing as distinct religious bodies. *Tr.*—‘We may infer that the Gnostic opinions, or at least something like that which was afterwards called Gnosticism, was professed in the time of the apostles.’—Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 30. *S.*]

distinguished for their numbers, or for fame and notoriety, till the times of *Adrian*. Under the appellation of Gnostics are included all those in the first ages of the church who modified the religion of *Christ* by joining with it the oriental philosophy, in regard to the source of evil, and the origin of this material universe. The leading principles of this philosophy have already been stated.

§ 4. All those eastern philosophers, believing that rational souls became connected with matter, and inhabitants of bodies, contrary to the will and pleasure of the supreme God, were in expectation of a mighty legate from the Deity, possessed of consummate wisdom and power, who would imbue, with a knowledge of the true God, the spirits now oppressed with the load of their bodies, and rescue them from bondage to the lords of this material world. When, therefore, some of them perceived that *Jesus* and his friends wrought miracles of a salutary character, they were ready to believe that *he* was that mighty legate of God, come to deliver men from the power of the genii, to whom they thought this world subject, and to free souls from their material bodies. This supposition being admitted into minds polluted with gross errors, they interpreted, or rather perverted, *whatever Christ* and his disciples taught, so as to make it harmonise with their *other* opinions.

§ 5. Hence there necessarily arose among them a multitude of opinions, extremely alien from the precepts of *Christ*. Their belief that the world was not created by the supreme God in whom is all perfection, but by one or more inferior deities of a bad, or at least of an imperfect, character, would not allow them to admit the divine authority of the Old Testament Scriptures, and it led some of them to venerate and extol the *serpent*, the prime author of sin among men, and likewise several of the vilest persons mentioned in the Jewish Scriptures. The same belief induced them to contemn *Moses* and the religion that he taught, and to represent him as instigated to impose such hard and unsuitable laws on the Jews, by the world's Creator, who had no regard for human happiness, but only for his own glory and authority. Their belief that *matter* is eternal and the source of all evil, prevented them from putting a due estimate upon the human body, and from favouring marriage, whereby bodies are produced, and also from admitting the doctrine of the future resurrection of the body. Their belief that malevolent genii ruled over the world, and that from them originated all the diseases, wars, and calamities of men, led them almost universally to addict themselves to *magic*, or the art of weakening and paralyzing the power of those genii. I omit many other points, as not compatible with a history so summary as this.

§ 6. Their principles required, that while they admitted *Christ* to be the *Son* of the supreme God, and messenger sent from the *Pleroma* or upper world where God and his family dwell, for the benefit of miserable souls, they should hold most unworthy sentiments concerning his person and offices. They could not, indeed, call him either God or a real man. True deity was inconsistent with

their notion, that he was, although begotten of God, yet every way far *inferior* to the Father. Man he could not be, because they considered everything concrete and corporeal intrinsically bad and vicious. Hence, most of them divested *Christ* of a material body, and denied him to have really undergone for the sake of men those sufferings which are recorded of him. The cause of his coming among us, they said, was no other than to strip the capricious genii, who tyrannise in this world, of their power over virtuous and heaven-born souls, and to teach men how to withdraw the divine mind from the impure body, and to fit it for a union with God.

§ 7. Their systems of morals, we are informed, were widely different. For most of them recommended abstinence and austerity, and prescribed the most severe bodily mortifications; in order that the soul, whose ill-fate it was to be associated with a body, might enjoy greater liberty, and be able the better to contemplate heavenly things. For, the more this depraved and grovelling habitation of the soul is weakened and attenuated, the less will it be able to withdraw the mind from the contemplation of divine objects. But some of them maintained, on the contrary, that we may safely indulge all our libidinous desires, and that there is no moral difference in human actions.¹ This contrariety of opinions need not surprise us, because the same principle naturally produced both systems. For persons who believed their bodies to be essentially evil, and meant for holding their souls in bondage, might, according as they were of a voluptuous or of a morose and austere disposition, either fall into the conclusion that the acts of the body have no connexion with the soul when it has attained to communion with God, or, on the contrary, suppose that the body must be strenuously resisted and opposed, as being the enemy of the soul.

§ 8. As these extraordinary opinions required proof, and as it was not easy to find anything favourable to them in the writings of the apostles, refuge was necessarily taken in fables and impostures. Therefore, when asked where they had learned what they so confidently taught, some produced fictitious books under the names of *Abraham*, *Zoroaster*, and *Christ*, or his apostles; others boasted of having derived their principles from a concealed and secret doctrine taught by *Christ*; others again affirmed that they had arrived at this high degree of wisdom by an innate energy which existed in their own minds; and some pretended that one *Theudas*, a disciple of *St. Paul*, or *Matthias*, one of *Christ's* disciples, had been their teacher. Those of them who did not wholly reject the books of the New Testament, either interpreted them very absurdly, neglecting the true import of words, or dishonestly corrupted them, by retrenching what they disliked, and adding what they pleased.

§ 9. It is easy to see how these persons, after assuming the name of Christians, became divided into so many sects. In the first place, before their adhesion to *Christ*, as is clear from what has been said

¹ See Clemens Alex. *Stromatt*, lib. iii. cap. v. p. 529, ed. Potter.

above, they were already divided in opinion. Hence, as each one endeavoured to accommodate *his own* philosophical opinions to the Christian religion, it was the necessary consequence that various systems of religion were produced. Moreover, some of them were born Jews, as *Cerinthus* and others, and did not wish to appear contemners of *Moses*; while others were wholly estranged from the Jewish religion, and could indulge themselves in liberties which the former could not. And lastly, this whole system of philosophy and religion, being without any fixed and solid basis, chiefly depended upon operations of the mind. Now, who does not know that variety is inseparable from systems and subjects which mind and imagination have under their control?

§ 10. The heads and leaders of the philosophical sects which troubled the church in the first century next come to be considered. The first place among them is, by many, given to *Dositheus*, a Samaritan. And it is sufficiently proved that there was a man of this name among the Samaritans about the times of our Saviour; and that he left a sect behind him. But all the extant accounts of this person clearly show that he is to be ranked, not among those called *heretics*, but among the enemies of the Christian name; or, if it be thought more correct, among the delirious and insane. For he wished himself to be thought the *Messiah*, or that prophet whom God had promised to the Jews: he could not, therefore, have held *Jesus Christ* to be a divine ambassador, nor have merely corrupted *his* doctrines.¹

§ 11. What I have said of *Dositheus* I would also say of the far-famed *Simon Magus*. This impostor is not to stand among those who corrupted Christianity by their own errors, that is, among *heretics*, but is to be thrust into that unhappy class which declared open war against it, in spite of the unanimity with which writers generally, both ancient and modern, make him the *head*, *ringleader*, and *father* of the whole heretical camp. For it is manifest, from all the accounts which we have of him, that after his defection from the Christians, he ascribed to *Christ* no honour at all; but set *himself* in opposition to *Christ*, and said that he was no other than the supreme power of God.²

¹ Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, l. ii. c. xiii. p. 307. Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclés.* par M. du Pin, t. iii. c. xiii. p. 304. [Mosheim, *Inst. hist. Chr. major*, p. 376. Walch, *Ketzcherhistorie*, i. 182. All the accounts make *Dositheus* to have lived among the Samaritans; one writer represents him as an apostate Jew. According to Origen (*Philocal.* i.), he was a rigorous observer of the law of *Moses*, and particularly allowed no one to move from the spot where the sabbath overtook him. According to Epiphanius (*Heres.* lib. i. pt. i. hæc. 13, previous to the Christian heresies), he was an apostate Jew, whose ambition being disappointed, he retired among the Samaritans, lived in a cave, and fasted so rigorously as to occasion his death. Other

ancient accounts simply mention him among the founders of sects; as *Hegesippus*, in *Eusebius*, *H. E.* iv. 22.—It is said that his followers accounted him the *Messiah* (*Photius*, *Biblioth.* cxxx.), and that he at first claimed to be so; but afterwards retracted, in presence of his pupil *Simon Magus* (*Clemens*, *Recogn.* ii. 8, &c.); *Eulogius*, bp. of Alexandria, in the seventh century, wrote against the *Dositheans* (according to *Photius*, *Biblioth.* cxxx.); and besides his pretended *Messiahship*, he attributes to *Dositheus* various errors, all of which coincided with either *Sadducean* or *Samaritan* opinions. See *J. E. C. Schmidt*, *Handb. d. christl. Kirchengeschichte*, i. § 50, 214, &c. *Tr.*]

² See Origen, *adv. Celsum*, lib. v. p. 272, ed. Spencer. [‘*Simon* probably was one of

§ 12. There are such obvious discrepancies and inconsistencies in the accounts of *Simon's* life and opinions, given us by the ancients, that some very learned men deny the possibility of applying them to any single person; and accordingly, besides the Simon known as *Magus*, who abandoned the Christian religion, they suppose another, who was a Gnostic *philosopher*. On this point men must judge as they please; but to *us* it appears neither safe nor necessary to go from the testimony of the ancients, who speak of only *one* Simon.¹ He was by birth either a Samaritan or a Jew, who after studying philosophy at Alexandria² made a public profession of magic, as was common in that age, and by fictitious prodigies persuaded the Samaritans, among other things, that he had received from God the power of controlling those evil spirits which afflict mankind.³ On seeing the miracles which *Philip* performed by divine power, Simon joined himself to him, professed to be a Christian, and hoped to learn from the Christians the art of working miracles. When cut off from this hope, by the severe language of *St. Peter*,⁴ he not only returned to his old course of sorcery, but also, wherever he went, he laboured to obstruct the progress of Christianity. The accounts of his tragical death, and of a statue decreed him at Rome, are rejected with great unanimity by the learned at the present day. They are at least uncertain and improbable.⁵

that class of adventurers which abounded at this period, or like Apollonius of Tyana, and others at a later time, with whom the opponents of Christianity attempted to confound Jesus and his apostles. His doctrine was oriental in its language and in its pretensions. He was the first *Æon*, or emanation, or rather, perhaps, the first manifestation of the primal Deity. He assumed not merely the title of the *Great Power*, or *Virtue of God*, but all the other appellations, *the Word*, *the Perfection*, *the Paraclete*, *the Almighty*, the whole combined attributes of the Deity.' (Milman's *Hist. of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire*. Lond. 1840, ii. 99.)—*The great power of God* appears from Acts viii. 10 to have been a designation for their master in general vogue among Simon's disciples. For the other titles borne by him, Dr. Milman cites Jerome. His followers appear to have existed until very near the time of Origen. 'Though it may be true that Simon Magus was an *enemy to the progress and advancement of Christianity*, though he cannot, in fact, be called a Christian, yet if he borrowed any part of the Christian scheme, and united it to his own, he would be called in ancient times a *heretic*, and the fathers assert that he was the parent of all heretics.'—Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 98. S.]

¹ See the Dissertation by G. C. Voelger, revised and published by Mosheim, *Diss. ad Histor. Eccles. pertinentes*, ii. 55, &c. de uno Simone Mago. [The idea of two Simons,

the one a Samaritan, mentioned Acts viii., the other a Jewish philosopher, in the reign of Domitian, and the father of all the Gnostic sects, was first thrown out as a *conjecture*, by Vitringa, *Observ. Sacrar.* l. v. c. 12, § 9, p. 159, and afterwards defended by C. A. Heumann, *Acta erudit. Lips.* for April, A.D. 1717, p. 179, and I. de Beausobre, *Diss. sur les Adamites*, pt. ii., subjoined to *L'Enfant's Histoire de la guerre des Hussites*, § 1, p. 350, &c.; but is now generally given up. Tr.]

² *Clementina*, Homil. ii. in *Patr. Apostol.* t. ii. p. 533. ['Justin Martyr, who was himself a Samaritan, informs us that Simon was a native of Gittum, a village in that country. Of his education we know nothing for certain; but in a work, which, although spurious, is of considerable antiquity, it is said that he studied at Alexandria, and was well versed in Grecian literature, as well as being a proficient in oratory and dialectics. That he studied at Alexandria, is not improbable: and he would have learnt in that city, what he seems undoubtedly to have professed, the doctrine of the Gnostics. The name of Gnosticism was, perhaps, not yet given to any particular sect of philosophers. But, as is generally the case in the progress of opinions, the thing existed, and had advanced a considerable way before it assumed a distinctive name.'—Burton's *Ecclesiastical History*, 56. S.]

³ Acts viii. 9, 10.

⁴ Acts viii. 20, *et seq.*

⁵ See Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire de*

§ 13. Simon undoubtedly belonged to that class of philosophers, who admitted, as co-existent with the supreme and all-perfect God, not only eternal *matter*, but also an *evil deity* who presided over it. And if I mistake not, he was one of those in this class, who believed matter to have been eternally animated, and at a certain period to have brought forth, by its inherent energies, that depraved being who now rules over it, surrounded by numerous attendants. From this opinion of Simon, the gross errors ascribed likewise to him by the ancients concerning *fate, the indifference of human actions, the human body's impurity, magic*, and other things naturally followed.¹ What was worse than all, he broached a shameless fiction, that the greatest and most powerful of the divine *Æons* of the male sex resided in himself; while another of the female sex, the mother of

Manichée, p. 203, 395. Anth. van Dale, *Diss. de Statua Simonis*, annexed to his book *de Oraculis*, p. 579. Sal. Deyling, *Observat. Sacrar.* l. i. Observ. xxxvi. p. 140. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, i. 340; and numerous others.—[What Arnobius, *adv. Gentes*, l. ii. p. 64, ed. Herald, and, after him, many others relate, with some variety, concerning Simon's death, viz. that while practising magic at Rome, in order to ingratiate himself with Nero, he attempted to fly, being assisted by evil spirits; but that by the prayers of St. Peter, the evil spirits were compelled to let him fall, which either killed him outright, or broke his bones, and so mortified him that he killed himself, is too improbable, and has too much the aspect of fiction to gain credit in this enlightened age.—And the mistake of Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. c. 34, who says he saw a public statue inscribed to Simon on an island in the Tiber at Rome, has been satisfactorily accounted for, since the discovery, in the year 1574, of a stone in the Tiber at Rome, bearing this inscription: SEMONI SANCO, DEO FIDIO [(SACRUM). S]. For this inscription, which Justin, being an Asiatic, might easily misunderstand, was undoubtedly intended for an ancient pagan god. *Tr.*] —‘The majority of learned men have since (since 1574) been of opinion that Justin, deceived by the similarity of names, mistook a statue in honour of a Sabine deity for one erected to Simon Magus.’ (Bp. Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, Lond. 1829, p. 126.) The inscription on this marble fragment stands thus:—

SEMONI
SANCO
DEO. FIDIO
SACRVM
SEX. POMPEIVS. SP. F.
COL. MVSSIANVS
QVINQVENNALIS
DECVR
BIDENTALIS
DONVM. DEDIT.

‘It has been supposed, that this inscription misled Justin, who was not well versed in the Latin language, and that he mistook SEMONI SANCO for SIMONI SANCTO.—It is generally described as the base of a statue, but Baronius (ad an. 44) thinks it too small to have ever had a statue upon it. Tillemont, who supports Justin, gives an undue advantage to his opponents by saying that a statue was discovered. The same mistake has been made by other writers.’ (Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 375.) The Latin Fathers, Tertullian and Augustin, quote this famous inscription. With them ignorance of the language is out of the question; ‘and it is to be remembered, that Justin made this statement in a defence which he presented to the emperor Antoninus Pius, about the year 140, when he was himself at Rome; and it is difficult to believe, that he could have been so deceived concerning the history of Simon, or that he could have invented a story which, if false, would have been detected, not only by the emperor, but by every person in Rome. Upon the whole, I am inclined to admit it as a fact, that Simon Magus came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, and that his doctrine met with an extraordinary reception.’—Burton's *Ecclesiastical History*, 175. S.]

¹ The dissertation of Jo. Hen. Horbicus, *de Simone Mago*, though a juvenile production, and needing correction in style, I prefer to all others on this subject. It will be found republished by Jo. Voigtius, in the *Biblioth. Hæresiologicalæ*, t. i. pt. iii. p. 511. Horbicus treads closely in the steps of his preceptor, Ja. Thomasius, who very clearly saw the source of those numerous errors by which the Gnostics, and especially Simon, were infected. The other writers who have treated of Simon are enumerated by Voigtius, *ubi supra*, p. 567. [See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 152, &c. There is a full, but not a very accurate, account of Simon in Calmet's *Dictionary of the Bible*, *Tr.*]

all human souls, resided in his mistress *Helena*; and he declared himself to have come among men, by God's command, for the purpose of overthrowing the rule of those beings who made this world, and of delivering *Helena* from their power.¹

§ 14. From Simon Magus, it is said, *Menander*, who was also a Samaritan, learned his doctrine; which is no more true than what the ancients relate, that all the heretical sects derived their origin from this Simon. *Menander* is to be struck from the list of those who may be properly called heretics, and classed among the senseless and infatuated coxcombs, who were led by a silly arrogance to play the Saviour of mankind. It is clear from the testimonies of *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, and *Tertullian*,² that he wished to be thought one of the *Æons*, sent from the upper world or the *Pleroma* to succour the souls that were here suffering miserably in material bodies, and to afford them aid against the machinations and the violence of the demons who governed our world. As he erected his religious system on the same fundamental principles as Simon did his, the ancients supposed that he must have been a disciple of Simon.³

§ 15. If those now mentioned are not reckoned among the *heretics* of the first century, the first place among the Christian sects, and also among those denominated Gnostics, seems to belong to the *Nicolaitans*, of whom *Jesus Christ* himself expressed his detestation.⁴ The Saviour, it is true, does not tax them with errors in matters of *faith*, but only with licentious *conduct*, and a disregard of the injunction of the

¹ Some very learned men, I am aware, have supposed that the ancient accounts of Simon's *Helena* should be interpreted allegorically; and that Simon intended, by the name of Helena, to indicate *matter*, or the *soul*, or something, I know not what. But for such an allegorical interpretation, it would be easy to show there is little foundation. [In *Tertullian's* treatise, *de Animâ*, it is said that 'Simon, indignant at the reproof which he received from St. Peter, determined in revenge to oppose the progress of the Gospel, and associated with himself in the undertaking a Tyrian prostitute, named Helena. He called himself the Supreme Father, Helena, his first conception, through whom he formed the design of creating the angels and archangels. She, however, becoming acquainted with the design, went out from the Father into the lower parts of the universe, and there, anticipating his intention, created the angelic powers, who were ignorant of the Father, and were the artificers of this world. They detained her with them through envy, lest, if she went away, they should be deemed the offspring of another, that is, as I interpret the words, not self-existent. Not content with detaining her, they subjected her to every species of indignity, in order that the consciousness of her humiliation might extinguish even the

wish to quit them. Thus they compelled her to take the human form, to be confined, as it were, in the bonds of the flesh, and to pass through different female bodies, among the rest, through that of the Spartan Helen, until at length she appeared as the Helena of Simon. She was the lost sheep mentioned in the parable, whom Simon descended to recover, and restore to heaven. Having effected his purpose, he determined, in revenge, to deliver mankind from the dominion of the angelic powers; and in order to elude their vigilance, he pretended to assume the human form, appearing as the Son in Judea, as the Father in Samaria.'—Kaye's *Tertullian*, 576. S.]

² [Irenæus, i. 23. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. p. 69. *Tertullian*, *de Animâ*, cap. 50, and *de Resurrect.* c. 5. Tr.]

³ ['*Tertullian* mentions *Menander*, the Samaritan, as the disciple of Simon Magus, and the master of Saturninus. One of his assertions was, that he was sent by the Supreme Power, to make all who received his baptism immortal and incorruptible: in other words, his baptism was itself the resurrection, and delivered all who partook of it from liability to death. Another of his opinions was, that the human body was created by angels. —Kaye's *Tertullian*, 577. S.]

⁴ Rev. ii. 6, 14, 15.

apostles to abstain from meats offered to idols, and from fornication.¹ But the writers of the second and the following centuries, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*,² and others, declare that they taught the same doctrines with the Gnostics, concerning *two principles* of things, the *Æons*, and this world's origin. Whether this testimony is to be admitted, or whether we are to suppose that the ancients confounded *two* different sects which bore the same name—the one the *Apocalyptical* Nicolaitans, and the other a Gnostic sect of the second century, founded by a man named *Nicolaus*—is a question which admits of doubt.³

§ 16. With greater propriety, we may reckon among the Gnostics *Cerinthus*, a Jew by birth,⁴ but initiated in letters and philosophy at Alexandria.⁵ Some of the learned have, indeed, chosen to assign him rather to the *second* century than to the first,⁶ yet it appears to

¹ Acts xv. 29.

² [Irenæus, iii. 11, and ii. 27. Tertull. de Præscript. c. 46. Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 4. Tr.]

³ [See *Demonstratio Sectæ Nicolaitarum*, adv. doctiss. ejus oppugnatores, cum Supplemento; in Mosheim's Dissert. ad Histor. Eccles. pertinent. i. 389—495. Also Mosheim's Institutt. Hist. Christ. major. p. 46, and Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c. p. 195, and especially Walch, Gesch. Ketz. i. 167. All the ancients, except John Cassianus (Collatio, xviii. c. 16), supposed that Nicolas of Antioch, the Deacon (Acts vi. 5), was either the founder or accidental cause of this sect. Irenæus makes him the founder; but Clemens Alex. states, that an incautious speech or act of his gave occasion only to this sect. For being one day accused of too much attention to his wife, when he came to defend himself, he publicly divorced her; using the expression, ὅτι παραφύσασθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δεῖ, it is proper to abuse the flesh; i. e. to subdue its corrupt propensities. This speech was afterwards perversely applied by a Gnostic association to justify their abominations. To this account agree Eusebius, H. E. iii. 29; Theodoret, Hæret. Fab. iii. 1, Opp. t. iv. p. 226; and Augustine, de Hæres. cap. 5. Now the question arises, whether there actually was, in the time of St. John, an heretical party holding different fundamental principles from the orthodox, and distinguished by the name of *Nicolaitans*. Mosheim takes the affirmative, on account of the historical credibility of the Fathers, and the literal import of the words used in the *Apocalypse*. The next question is, Who was the founder of this sect? Here some follow Irenæus, others Clemens Alex.; and some, among whom is Mosheim, think it probable there were two persons of the name of *Nicolaus*. If this supposition be admitted, it will be easy to account for the fact, that the Nicolaitans of the Fathers are accused

of Gnosticism, while there is no mention of it in the *Apocalypse*.—Baumgarten's *Auszug der Kirchengeschichte. Schl.*—'Towards the end of the century there were some Gnostics who did not scruple to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and these men were known by the name of Nicolaitans. The origin of the term is uncertain; and though Nicolas, the Deacon, has been mentioned as their founder, the evidence is extremely slight which would convict that person of any immoralities.'—Burton's *Ecclesiastical History*, 274. S.]

⁴ [For Epiphanius states, *Hæres.* xxviii. § 3, that he was circumcised; and Johannes Damascenus, *de Hæres.* cap. 8, that his followers were *Jews*. His doctrines also show higher respect for the Jewish forms of worship than is common for the Gnostic heretics. Walch's *Entw. der Historie der Ketz.* i. 260. *Schl.*]

⁵ Theodoret, *Fabul. Hæret.* ii. 3. Opp. t. iii. 219.

⁶ See Sam. Basnage, *Annal. Polit. Eccles.* ii. 6, Peter Faydit, *Eclaircissements sur l'histoire ecclès. de deux premiers siècles*, cap. v. p. 64, and others.—With these, Jo. Fr. Buddeus contends, *de Ecclesia Apostol.* cap. v. p. 412 [and Tillemont, *Mémoires*, ii. 486, and Mosheim, *Institutt. Hist. Eccles. major. sæc.* i. p. 439, &c. They who place Cerinthus in the *second* century, rely chiefly on two arguments. The *first* is, that the ancient writers who treat of the heretics, set down Cerinthus after Marcion [rather after Carpocrates. Tr.]—the other rests on a spurious letter of Pius, bishop of Rome [in the middle of the *second* century, Tr.] to Justus, bishop of Vienne; in which Pius laments that Cerinthus was at that time making many proselytes. The epistle may be found in Coustant, *Epistol. Pontific. Append.* i. 19 [and in Binus, *Concil. Gen.* i. 124. Tr.]—But the *first* argument proves nothing, because the historians of the heresies

have been while St. *John* was still living that he ventured upon forming a strange kind of system and religion, by combining the doctrines and principles of *Jesus Christ* with those of the Gnostics and Jews. From the Gnostics he borrowed the notions of a *Pleroma*, *Æons*, a *Demiurge*, and the like, but modified, so as to make them seem not quite inconsistent with Jewish opinions. Thus to the creator of this world, whom he thought likewise the lord and lawgiver of the Jewish nation, he ascribed a *nature* possessed of the highest virtues, and sprung from God himself, but one, he added, which had gradually declined from its native excellence, and fallen upon things unworthy of it. Hence *God* had determined to subvert his power through one of the most blessed *Æons*, whose name was *Christ*. This *Christ* had entered into a certain Jew named *Jesus* (a very righteous and holy man, the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*, by ordinary generation), by descending upon him in the form of a dove, at the time when he was baptized by *John* in the river *Jordan*. After his union with *Christ*, this *Jesus* vigorously assailed the God of the Jews, the world's creator; and by *his* instigation, *Jesus* was seized by the rulers of the Jewish nation and nailed to the cross. But when *Jesus* was apprehended *Christ* flew away to heaven, so that only the man *Jesus* was put to death. *Cerinthus* required his followers to worship the supreme God, the father of *Christ*, together with *Christ* himself, but to abandon the Jewish Lawgiver, whom he accounted the creator of this world; and, while they retained some parts of the Mosaic law, to regulate their lives, chiefly by the precepts of *Christ*. He promised them a resurrection of their bodies, which would be succeeded by exquisite delights, in the millenary reign of *Christ*; and then would follow a happy and never-ending life in the celestial world. For *Cerinthus* supposed that *Christ* would hereafter return, and would unite himself again with the man *Jesus*, in whom he had before dwelt, and would reign with his followers during a thousand years in Palestine.¹

pay no regard to chronological order; and the *second* falls, because the epistle is not genuine. *Schl.*]—[But see on this subject, Fr. Ad. Lampe, *Commentar. in Johan. Proleg.* lib. ii. c. 3, § 13, &c. p. 181, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ [The doctrines of *Cerinthus* are stated in full by C. W. F. Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 260, &c., and by Mosheim, *Institut. hist. Christ. major.* p. 445, and *Comment. de Reb. Christ.* p. 196.—*Irenæus*, *adv. Hæres.* iii. 3, says he had heard from various persons that *Polycarp* told *them*, that the apostle *John* once met *Cerinthus* in a public bath at *Ephesus*, and instantly fled out, saying he was afraid the bath would fall on that enemy of the truth and kill him. This story may be true, notwithstanding *Irenæus* had it from third-hand testimony. But the addition to it, that *Cerinthus* was actually killed by the fall of the building, as soon as *John* was gone out, was first annexed in

modern times by the Dominican *Bernhard* of *Luxemburg*, in his *Catalogus Hæreticorum*, and it deserves no credit. See Walch, *ubi supra*, p. 225. *Schl.*—*Cerinthus* 'seems to have had his residence for some time at *Ephesus*; and he found the people in that country but too well disposed to embrace his doctrines. He inculcated, as I have stated, the greatest laxity of morals.' *Irenæus* says that St. *John* wrote his Gospel 'to root out the erroneous doctrine which had been spread by *Cerinthus*, and some time before by the *Nicolaitans*.' (*Burton's Ecclesiastical History*, 274, 281.) 'According to *Irenæus*, *Cerinthus* taught that the world was created by a power quite subordinate to the highest God, which did not even so much as know this God, who was elevated above everything. According to *Epiphanius*, he held that the world was created by angels.' (*Rose's Neander*, ii. 51.) *Neander*

§ 17. Those who maintained the necessity of the Mosaic law and ceremonies in order to eternal salvation, had not proceeded so far in this century as to have no communion with such as thought differently. They were, therefore, accounted brethren, though weaker ones. But after the second destruction of Jerusalem in the reign of *Adrian*, when they withdrew from other Christians and set up separate congregations, they were regarded as *sectarians*, who had deviated from the true doctrines of *Christ*. Hence arose the names *Nazarenes*¹ and *Ebionites*; by which those Christians, who erred from excessive attachment to the Mosaic law, were distinguished from their brethren generally, whose opinion was, that the system established by Moses had been abrogated by *Christ*. These *Nazarenes* or *Ebionites*, however, though commonly set down among the sects of the apostolic age, really belong to the *second* century, in which they first attracted notice.

subsequently expresses a doubt whether Cerinthus thought the creating angels really ignorant of the Supreme God, but rather inclines to a belief that he considered their acquaintance with the paramount Deity, and his abode, imperfect; fuller information upon such subjects waiting for a revelation through the divine *Logos*, or *Word*. At the head of the creating angels was placed one who promulged the Mosaic law, which Cerinthus represented as greatly superior to any anterior religious system, but immeasurably below the Messiah's revelation. He considered Jesus chosen to make this on account of his extraordinary qualities, intellectual, moral, and religious. But he himself had no suspicion of his destination to this illustrious office, until he was baptized by John,

when the Supreme *Logos*, or Spirit of God, came down upon him from heaven, in the likeness of a dove, and sank into his heart. He was thus connected with the Supreme God, and hence elevated in rank, power, and wisdom above this whole world, and the angels who preside over it. He now had such a perfect knowledge of the Supreme God, and of heavenly things, that the angels might learn of him, and it was by virtue of the Spirit united with him that he wrought miracles. While this union continued, suffering was impossible; but the Spirit flew up again to the Father, and the man Jesus was violently cut off. *S.*]

¹ On the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites*, see cent. ii. pt. ii. c. v. § 2, 3, and notes.

SECOND CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Character of the Roman emperors — § 2. Propagation of Christianity in the Roman empire — § 3. Countries enlightened by Christianity — § 4. Conversion of the Germans. — § 5. The Gauls converted — § 6. Translations of the N. T. — § 7. Apologies and other writings of Christians — § 8. Miracles and extraordinary gifts — § 9. Miracle of the thundering legion — § 10. It is uncertain — § 11. Sedition and slaughter of the Jews — § 12. Philosophers become Christians.

§ 1. Most of those who governed Rome in this age were of the milder cast. *Trajan*,¹ though too eager for glory, and not always sufficiently considerate and provident, was a kind and clement prince. *Adrian*² was rather harsher, yet still not absolutely bad or unjust, but, in fact, a compound of virtues and vices. Than the *Antonines*³ nothing could be better and more benign. Even *Severus*,⁴ who afterwards assumed another character, was at first oppressive to no one, and to the Christians mild and equitable.

§ 2. Through this lenity of the emperors, Christians living in the Roman empire suffered far less than they would have done if they had been under severer lords. The laws enacted against them were indeed sufficiently hard; and the magistrates, excited by the priests and the populace, often made considerable havoc among them, and went frequently much beyond what the laws required. Yet for these evils some relief was commonly attainable. *Trajan* would not have *the Christians to be sought after*, and ordered no account to be taken of anonymous accusations against them.⁵ *Antoninus Pius* even decreed,

¹ A.D. 98—117. ² A.D. 117—183.

³ Pius, A.D. 133—161. Marcus Aurelius the Philosopher, A.D. 161—180, with Verus, A.D. 161—169, and Commodus, A.D. 169—192. ⁴ A.D. 193—211.

⁵ See Pliny's *Epistles*, lib. x. ep. 98.

[This is a short epistle from the emperor in answer to a long one, which stands immediately before it, and which seeks the imperial direction in dealing with proceedings against Christians. Among the engines which assailed them were anonymous

that their accusers should be punished.¹ Some in one way, and others in another, protected them against the evil designs of the populace and the priests. Hence the Christian community increased, and became vastly numerous in this century. Of this fact we have the clearest testimony of the ancients, which some have vainly attempted to call in question.²

§ 3. On what particular countries, both within the Roman empire and beyond it, the light of heavenly truth first shone in this century, the scantiness of ancient records will not allow us to state with precision. There are unexceptionable witnesses, who declare, that in nearly all the East, and among the Germans, Spaniards, Celts, Britons, and other nations, *Christ* was now worshipped as God.³ But if any

accusations affecting many individuals. Pliny says, *propositus est libellus sine auctore, multorum nomina continens*. When considerable numbers were apprehended upon such information, many of them seem immediately to have disclaimed Christianity, and to have paid, in confirmation, divine honours to the gods. Trajan thus disposes of the anonymous accusers: *sine auctore vero propositi libelli nullo crimine locum habere debent*. It is evident also that he wished them to be unmolested, as he said, *conquirendi non sunt*, but he did not venture to promise them security. If regularly convicted, they were to pay the legal penalty. *Si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt*. But then he would not allow any to be punished who took part in heathen rites, when called in question, however suspicious their former conduct might have been. *Qui negaverit se Christianum esse, idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, id est, supplicando dīs nostris, quamvis suspectus in præteritum fuerit, veniam ex pœnitentia impetret*. This, though a strong temptation to sinful compliances for a temporary purpose, was an important protection against malicious feelings and sinister designs. Trajan's letter does not, however, manifest religious feeling of any kind. Even in forbidding governors to act upon anonymous information, it goes no further than stamping such proceedings as highly dangerous, and unworthy of an enlightened age. *Pessimi exempli, nec nostri sæculi est*. 'Trajan writes like an honourable soldier, not like a philosopher or a lawgiver studying the good of mankind. His approbation of Pliny's general conduct was harsh and severe. His saying that Christians were not to be searched for, shows an opinion of their innocence, and also some fear of them; his adding that they were to be punished if brought before him is scarcely just. Tertullian is eloquent upon this inconsistency. — Pliny had the government of the province of Bithynia, or Pontus and Bithynia; but he was not called *proconsul*, only *pro-*

prætor with proconsular power; his letter to Trajan was written from his province, and might be dated in the year 106 or 107.² — *Hey's Lectures*, i. 202. S.]

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 13 [where the law of Antoninus is given at length [with a reference to] Melito. Some indeed have supposed that it was Marcus Antoninus, and not Antoninus Pius, who issued this decree. (So Valesius in *loc.*) But this is contrary to the express testimony of Eusebius, and to the contents of the edict itself. For we know from history, that the earthquakes mentioned in the edict happened under Pius. See Capitolinus, *Life of Antoninus Pius*, cap. 3. Besides, if Marcus himself had published this edict, Melito could have had no occasion, by his Apology, to implore the grace of the emperor in favour of the Christians. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 240. *Schl.*] [But this edict, which must not be confounded with Antoninus's confirmation of Adrian's Rescript, is spurious. Cf. Rose's *Neander*, i. 100; *Gieseler*, i. 131; *Robertson*, i. 49. *Ed.*]

² See Walt. Moyle, *de Legionē fulminatrice*; a Latin translation of which, with notes, I have annexed to my *Syntagma Diss. ad sanctiores disciplinas pertinent.* p. 652, 661. See also an additional passage, in Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryphone*, p. 341.

³ Irenæus, *adv. Hæres.* i. 10; Tertullian, *adv. Judæos*, 7. [The testimony of the former is this: 'Neither do those churches, which are established among the Germans, believe or teach otherwise; nor do those among the Hiberii, or among the Celts; nor those in the East; nor those in Egypt; nor those in Libya; nor those established in the *central parts of the world*.' — The language of Tertullian is rhetorical, and the statement, undoubtedly, somewhat too strong. He says: 'In whom, but the Christ now come, have all nations believed? For, in whom do all other nations (but yours, the Jews) confide? Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, and inhabit-

inquire, which of these nations received Christianity in *this* century, and which in the preceding? it is not in my power to answer.—*Pantænus*, master of the school in Alexandria, is said to have instructed the Indians in Christianity.¹ But these Indians appear to have been certain Jews, living in Arabia Felix. For *Pantænus* found among them, according to the testimony of *Jerome*, the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, which they had received from their first teacher *Bartholomew*.

§ 4. From *Gaul*, it would seem, the Christian religion must have spread into *Germany* on the left of the Rhine, which was subject to the Romans, and also into *Britain* over against Gaul.² Yet certain churches in Germany have been accustomed to deduce their origin from the companions and disciples of *St. Peter* and other apostles ;³

ants of Pontus and Asia and Pamphylia; the dwellers in Egypt, and inhabitants of the region beyond Cyrene, Romans and strangers; and in Jerusalem both Jews and proselytes; so that the various tribes of the Getuli and the numerous hordes of the Mauri; all the Spanish clans, and the different nations of Gauls, and the regions of the Britons inaccessible to the Romans, but subject to Christ; and of the Sarmatians, and the Dacians, and Germans, and Scythians, and many unexplored nations and countries and islands unknown to us, and which we cannot enumerate:—in all which places the name of the Christ who has already come now reigns.' *Tr.*]

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 10. *Jerome*, *de Scriptoris Illustr.* c. 36. [According to Eusebius, the zeal of *Pantænus* prompted him to undertake a voluntary mission among the Indians. But according to *Jerome* (*l. c.* and epist. 83, Opp. t. iv. pt. ii. p. 656, ed. Bened.) he was sent out by *Demetrius*, bp. of Alexandria, in consequence of a request made by the Indians for a Christian teacher. Perhaps *Pantænus* first spontaneously travelled among the nearer Arabians; and, upon the request of the people here called Indians, for a teacher, *Demetrius* directed him to visit that people. — As the Greek and Latin writers give the name of Indians to the Persians, Parthians, Medes, Arabians, Ethiopians, Libyans, and many other nations, to them little known, the learned have inquired who were the Indians visited by *Pantænus*? Many think they were those we call the East Indians, inhabiting the country about the river Indus. *Jerome* so thought; for he represents him as sent to instruct the Brahmins. *Hen. Valesius* and *Lu. Holstenius* and others suppose they were the Abyssinians or Ethiopians, who were often called Indians, and were near, and always had intercourse with the Egyptians. See *S. Basnage*, *Annal. polit. eccl.* ii. 207. *Valesius*, *Adnotat. ad Socratis Hist. Eccl.* p. 13. Others incline to believe them Jews, resident in

Yemen or Arabia Felix, a country often called India. That they were not strangers to Christianity, is evident from their having *Matthew's Gospel* among them, and from their desiring some one to expound it to them. Their applying to the bishop of Alexandria shows that Egypt was to them the most accessible Christian country; and their having the Gospel written in *Hebrew*, as *Jerome* testifies, is good proof that they were Jews; because no other people understood that language. Besides, *Bartholomew* had formerly been among them, the field of whose labours has been supposed to be Arabia Felix. See *Tillemont's* life of *Bartholomew*, in his *Mémoires*, i. 1160, 1161. — See *Mosheim*, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 206, 207. *Tr.*]

² On the origin of those German churches, mentioned by *Tertullian* and *Irenæus*, as existing in this century, *Jo. Hen. Ursinus*, *Bebelius*, and others have written; and still better, *Gabriel Liron*, *Singularitez historiques et littéraires*, tom. iv. Paris, 1740, 8vo. — The common and popular accounts of the first preachers of the Gospel in Germany, are learnedly impugned by *Aug. Calmet*, *Histoire de Lorraine*, i. *Diss. sur les Evêques de Treves*, p. 3, 4. *Bolland*, *Acta Sanctorum*, January, ii. 922. *Jo. Nic. de Hontheim*, *Diss. de æra episcopat. Trevirensis*; in *Historia Trevirensis*, t. i.

³ [It is said, *St. Peter* sent *Eucharius*, *Valerius*, and *Maternus*, into Belgic Gaul; and that they planted the churches of Cologne, Treves, Tongres, Liege, and some others; and presided over them till their death. See *Christo. Brower*, *Annales Trevirenses*, ii. 143, &c., and *Acta Sanctor. Antwerpensis*, 29th of January, p. 918. — But *Calmet*, *Bolland*, and *Hontheim* (*ubi supra*), have proved satisfactorily that these pretended founders of the German churches did not live earlier than the third or fourth century, and were first represented as being legates of the apostles in the middle ages. — See *Mosheim*, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 212. *Tr.*]

and the Britons, following *Bede*, would fain believe, that their king *Lucius* sought and obtained Christian teachers from *Eleutherus*, the Roman pontiff, in this century, and during the reign of *Marcus Antoninus*.¹ But these ancient accounts are exposed to much doubt, and are rejected by the best-informed persons.

§ 5. Transalpine Gaul, which is now called *France*, perhaps received some knowledge of the Gospel before this century, either from the apostles or from their friends and disciples. But unequivocal

¹ See Ja. Ussher, *Antiquitates Ecclesiar. Britannicar.* cap. i. p. 7. Francis Godwin, *de Conversione Britann.* cap. i. p. 7. Rapin de Thoyras, *History of England*, vol. i. [Will. Burton, *Adnotat. ad Clementis Rom. epist. ad Corinth.* in *Patribus Apostol.* ii. 470. Edw. Stillington, *de Antiquitate Ecclesiar. Britann.* cap. i. Fred. Spanheim, *Historia Eccles. major. sæcul. ii.* p. 603, 604. — The first publication of the Gospel in Britain has been attributed to James the son of Zebedee, to Simon Zelotes, to Aristobulus (mentioned *Rom.* xvi. 10), to St. Peter, &c., by some few legendary writers, who are cited by Ussher, *Ecclesiæ Britann. Primordia*, cap. i. — But rejecting these accounts, William of Malmesbury, and after him many other monks, maintained that Joseph of Arimathea, with twelve others, were sent from Gaul, by St. Philip, into Britain, A.D. 63; that they were successful in planting Christianity; spent their lives in Britain; had twelve hides of land assigned them by the king at Glastonbury, where they first built a church of hurdles, and afterwards established a monastery. By maintaining the truth of this story, the English clergy obtained the precedence of some others in several councils of the fifteenth century, and particularly that of Basil, A.D. 1434. (Ussher's *Primordia*, ch. ii. p. 12—30.) Since the Reformation this story has been given up by most of the English clergy. But as Eusebius (*Demonstrat. Evang.* iii. 5) and Theodoret (*Græcar. Curatio Affectionum*, l. ix.) name the Britons, among others, to whom the Apostles themselves preached the Gospel, some have maintained that St. Paul must have visited that country; and they urge that Clemens Rom. says that this apostle travelled ἐπὶ τὸ πέραρ τῆς ὁρίωνος, to the utmost bounds of the west. They also urge, that among the many thousand Romans who passed over into Britain in the reign of Claudius and his successors, there were doubtless some Christians who would spread the knowledge of Christ there. But the principal reliance has been on the reported application of King Lucius to pope Eleutherus for Christian teachers, about A.D. 150, or rather 176. (Ussher, *Primordia*, ch. iv. p. 44, &c.)—On all these traditions, Dr.

Mosheim passes the following judgment: 'Whether any apostle, or any companion of an apostle, ever visited Britain, cannot be determined; yet the balance of probability rather inclines towards the affirmative. The story of Joseph of Arimathea might arise from the arrival of some Christian teacher from Gaul, in the second century, whose name was Joseph. As the Gauls, from Dionysius, bp. of Paris, in the second century, made Dionysius the Areopagite to be their apostle; and the Germans made Maternus, Eucharius, and Valerius, who lived in the third and fourth centuries, to be preachers of the first century, and attendants on St. Peter; so the British monks, I have no doubt, made a certain Joseph, from Gaul, in the second century, to be Joseph of Arimathea.—As to Lucius, I agree with the best British writers, in supposing him to be the restorer and second father of the English churches; and not their original founder. That he was a king is not probable; because Britain was then a Roman province. He might be a nobleman, and governor of a district. His name is Roman. His application I can never believe was made to the bp. of Rome. It is much more probable he sent to Gaul for Christian teachers. The independence of the ancient British churches on the see of Rome, and their observing the same rights with the Gallic churches, which were planted by Asiatics, and particularly in regard to the time of Easter, show that they received the Gospel from Gaul, and not from Rome.'—See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 213, &c. *Tr.*—The name Lucius may be merely a Latin form of a British word; but the [letter of] application attributed to this prince is open to strong suspicion. It first appeared in the *Customs of London*, published under Henry VIII., and nothing is known of any authority to substantiate it. Yet such as it is, little or nothing can be collected from it in favour of the Roman see, the very service into which it is generally pressed. Lucius might seem to have requested the pope to send him 'a copy of the Roman and imperial laws, with a design to make them the rule of justice in the realm of Britain.'—Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, Lond. 1708, i. 14. S.]

proofs of the existence of churches in this part of Europe first occur in the present century. For in it *Pothinus*, a man of distinguished piety and devotedness to *Christ*, in company with *Irenæus* and other holy men, proceeded from Asia to Gaul, and there instructed the people with such success, that he gathered churches of Christians at *Lyons* and *Vienne*, of which *Pothinus* himself was the first bishop.¹

¹ Peter de Marca, *Epistola de Evangelii in Gallia initiis*, published among his dissertations, and also by Valesius, subjoined to *Euseb. H. E. Jo. Launoi, Opuscula*, in his *Opp. ii.—Histoire Littéraire de la France*, i. 223. Gabr. Liron, *Singularitez historiques et littéraires*; the whole fourth volume, Paris, 1740, 8vo. and others.—[The most eminent French writers have disputed about the origin of their churches. Three different opinions have been advanced. The first is that of Jo. Launoi (*ubi supra*), whom many writers of eminence at this day follow. It is, that if we except the Asiatic colonists of Lyons and Vienne, among whom there were Christian churches formed about A.D. 150, the first propagation of Christianity among the Transalpine Gauls was by missionaries from Rome about A.D. 250. This hypothesis is founded chiefly on the testimony of three ancient writers; viz. Sulpicius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, ii. 32, where, speaking of the persecution at Lyons and Vienne, under Marcus Antoninus (A.D. 177), he says: *Ac tunc primum inter Gallias martyria visa; serius trans Alpes Dei religione suscepta; these were the first martyrs among the Gauls; for the divine religion was not received till late beyond the Alps*. The next testimony is that of the author of the *Acts of Saturninus*, bishop of Toulouse, who suffered under Decius. The author is supposed to have written in the beginning of the fourth century. He says: *Raras tertio sæculo in aliquibus Galliæ civitatibus ecclesiæ paucorum Christianorum devotione consurrexisse: scattered churches of a few Christians, arose in some cities of Gaul in the third century*. See T. Ruinart, *Acta Martyr. sincera*, p. 130. The third testimony is that of Gregory of Tours, the father of French history (in the *Historia Francor.* i. 28, and *de Gloria Confessorum*, cap. 30, ed. Ruinart, p. 399). He says, sub Decio septem viros ad prædicandum Romæ in Galliam missos esse: *under Decius (A.D. 248—251), seven missionaries were sent from Rome to preach in Gaul*. Now these seven missionaries are the very persons who are said to have been sent thither by St. Paul and St. Peter; viz. Trophimus bishop of Arles, Stremonius bishop of Clermont, Martial bishop of Limoges, Paul bishop of Narbonne, Saturninus bishop of Toulouse, Gatian bishop of Tours, and Dionysius bishop of Paris. The second opinion is, that

of the strenuous advocates for the apostolic origin of the Gallic churches, Peter de Marca (*ubi supra*), Natalis Alexander (*Histor. Eccles. Sæcul. I.* diss. 16, 17, vol. iii. p. 356—420, ed. Paris, 1741, 4to.), and others. They consider St. Paul and St. Peter as the fathers of their church. Paul, they suppose, travelled over nearly all France, in his supposed journey to Spain; and also sent St. Luke and Crescens into that country. For the last, they allege 2 *Tim.* iv. 10, "Crescens to Galatia;" or rather to Gaul, according to Epiphanius and others, who, for *Galariam*, would read *Γαλλίαν*. St. Peter, they suppose, sent Trophimus his disciple into Gaul. St. Philip, they also suppose, laboured in Gaul. And the seven bishops, above mentioned, they say, were sent by the apostles from Rome.—Very few at this day embrace the opinion entire. It rests principally on very suspicious testimony or conjectures, and on vulgar traditions. The third opinion takes a middle course, between the first and the second; and is that which is maintained by Gabr. Liron, *Diss. sur l'Etablissement de la religion Chrétienne dans les Gaules; Singularitez historiques*, &c. vol. iv. Paris, 1740, 8vo. It admits that Launoi, Sirmond, and Tillemont have fully proved, that Dionysius, the first bishop of Paris, was not Dionysius the Areopagite, mentioned *Acts* xvii. 34, but a man who lived in the third century. It also gives up the story of St. Philip, and of most of the pretended apostolic missionaries to Gaul. But it maintains the probability of Paul's travelling over Gaul on his way to Spain; and of his sending Luke and Crescens to that country; and it affirms that in the second century, there were many flourishing churches in Gaul, besides those of Lyons and Vienne.

Mosheim (*De Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 208, &c.) thinks none of these opinions is fully confirmed in all parts. The second, he gives up wholly. The third, he conceives, lacks evidence. Particularly, Paul's journey to Spain, is itself questionable; and if admitted, there is no proof that he passed through Gaul. For St. Luke's mission to Gaul, there is no evidence but the declaration of Epiphanius (*Hæres. l. i. § 11*), who, to say the least, is not the best authority; and, besides, might possibly mean Cisalpine Gaul. The mission of Crescens to Gaul, mentioned by Epiphanius, in the same con-

§ 6. This rapid propagation of Christianity is ascribed by the writers of the second century almost exclusively to the efficient will of God, to the energy of divine truth, and to the miracles wrought by Christians. Yet human counsels and pious efforts ought not to be wholly overlooked. Much was undoubtedly effected by the activity of pious men, who recommended and communicated to the people around them the writings of Christ's ambassadors, which were already collected into one volume. All people, indeed, were not acquainted with the language in which these divine books were composed; but this obstacle was early removed by the labours of translators. As the language of the Romans was extensively used, many Latin translations, as we are informed by *Augustine*,¹ were made at an early period. Of these, that which is called the *Italic Version*² was preferred to all others. The Latin version was followed by a Syriac, an Egyptian, an Ethiopic, and some others. But the precise dates of these several translations cannot be ascertained.³

§ 7. Those who wrote *apologies* for the Christians, and thus broke the force of those falsehoods and contumelies, by which they were unjustly assailed, removed some obstacles to the progress of *Christ's* religion, and in this way contributed not a little to the enlargement of the church. For very many were prevented from embracing Christianity, solely by those detestable calumnies with which ungodly men asspersed it.⁴ Another support to the Christian cause was

nexion, depends entirely on the contested reading of Γαλλίαν for Γαλατίαν, 2 *Tim.* iv. 10, and which, if admitted, might be understood of Cisalpine Gaul. If there were many flourishing churches in Gaul before Pothinus went there (which perhaps was the case), this will not prove them to have been planted by the *apostles* and their companions, which is the point contended for. —As to the *first* opinion, namely, that Pothinus and his companions *first* preached the Gospel in Gaul, it is not fully substantiated. Sulpicius Severus only affirms that it was *late* before the Gospel was preached there; and not, that it never was preached there till the times of Pothinus. The testimony of the *Acts of Saturninus* only shows, that the progress of the Gospel in Gaul was so slow, that there were but few churches there in the *third* century; which might be true, even if the apostles had there erected one or two churches. The testimony of Gregory of Tours fully disproves the apostolic age of the seven Gallic missionaries; and shows that the Christians in Gaul were few in number before the reign of Decius; but it does not show *when* the Gospel was first preached in that country. On the whole, Mosheim thinks it probable, the Gospel was preached in Gaul *before* the second century, and possibly by Luke, or Crescens, or even by some apostle. But he thinks Christianity for a long time made

very little progress in that country, and that probably the churches there had become almost extinct, when Pothinus and his companions from Asia planted themselves at Lyons and Vienne, about A.D. 150. Nearly the same opinion was embraced by Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iv. 983. *Tr.*]

¹ Augustine, de *Doctrina Christiana*, ii. 11 and 15. [Qui Scripturas ex Hebræa lingua in Græcam verterunt, numerari possunt, Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuique, primis fidei temporibus, in manus venit codex Græcus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque lingue habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari. — In ipsis autem interpretationibus, *Itala* cæteris præferatur: nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ. S.]

² See J. G. Carpzov, *Critica Sacra V. T.* p. 663 [and the *Introductions to the New Test.* by Michaëlis, Horne, and others. *Tr.*]

³ See Ja. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, liv. ix. c. i. t. i. p. 450.

⁴ [‘Nothing more injurious can be conceived than the terms of contempt, indignation, and reproach, which the heathens employed in expressing their hatred against the Christians, who were called by them *atheists*, because they derided the heathen polytheism; *magicians*, because they wrought miracles; *self-murderers*, because they suffered martyrdom cheerfully for the truth; *haters of the light*, because, to avoid the

furnished by the writers against the *heretics*. For the doctrines of these sects were so absurd, or so abominable, and the morals of some of them so disgraceful and impious, as to induce many to stand aloof from Christianity. But when they learned from the books against the heretics, that the true followers of *Christ* held these perverse men in abhorrence, their feelings towards them were changed.

§ 8. It is easier to conceive, than to express, how much the *miraculous powers* and the *extraordinary divine gifts*, which the Christians exercised on various occasions, contributed to extend the limits of the church. The gift of foreign tongues appears to have gradually ceased, as soon as many nations became enlightened with the truth, and numerous churches of Christians were everywhere established; for it became less necessary than it was at first. But the other gifts, with which God favoured the rising church of *Christ*, were, as we learn from numerous testimonies of the ancients, still conferred on particular persons here and there.¹

fury of the persecutions raised against them, they were forced, at first, to hold their religious assemblies in the night; with a multitude of other ignominious epithets employed against them by Tacitus, Suetonius, Celsus, &c. See Bingham, *Antiquities*, book i. ch. ii. p. 5. *Macl.*]

¹ Collections of these testimonies have been made, by Tob. Pfanner, *de Donis miraculosis*; and by W. Spencer, *Notes on Origen against Celsus*, p. 5, 6; but the most copious is by Mammachius, *Origines et Antiquitates Christianæ*, i. 363, &c. [The principal testimonies of the second and third centuries, are Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. c. 6; *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 39 and 82; Irenæus, ii. 31, and v. 6; and in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 7; Tertullian, *Apolog.* c. 23, 27, 32, 37; *ad Scap.* c. 2; Origen, *contra Cels.* l. i. p. 7, and l. vii. p. 334, ed. Spencer; Dionys. Alex. in Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 40; Minucius Felix, *Octav.* p. 361, ed. Paris, 1605; Cyprian, *de Idol. Vanit.* p. 14, *ad Demetrian.* p. 191, ed. Brem. — That what are called the *miraculous* gifts of the Holy Spirit, were liberally conferred, not only in this, but also in the following century, especially on those engaged in propagating the Gospel, all who are called Christians believe, on the unanimous and concordant testimony of the ancient writers. Nor do we, in my opinion, hereby incur any just charge of departing from sound reason. For, as these witnesses are all grave men, fair and honest, some of them philosophers, men who lived in different countries, and relate not what they *heard*, but what they *saw*, call God to witness the truth of their declarations (see Origen, *contra Celsum*, l. i. p. 35, ed. Spencer), and do not claim for themselves, but attribute to others, these miraculous powers; what reason can there be for refusing to believe them? Yet

a few years since, there appeared among the Britons, a man of no ordinary genius and learning, Conyers Middleton, who published a considerable volume, accusing the whole Christian world of credulity in this matter, and boldly pronouncing all that was said or written by the numerous ancients, concerning these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, to be false. See *A free Inquiry into the miraculous powers, &c.* London, 1749, 4to. The history of this famous book, and of the sharp contests it produced in England, may be learned from the British, French, and German literary journals, and from the German translation and refutation of the work which has been recently published. I shall here offer only a few observations on this, in many respects, most important subject. The apostolic age, the learned Middleton himself acknowledges to have been fruitful in miracles and extraordinary gifts. But he denies their continuance after the decease of the apostles; and concludes that whatever accounts exist of miracles in the *second* and *third* centuries, are the invention of crafty impostors, or the dreams of weak and deluded men. And he attributes great importance to this opinion, because the pretended miracles of the Romish saints rest on the same supports and arguments, as these miracles of the early ages; so that the former can never be disproved, if the latter be admitted. This looks honest, and worthy of a sound Christian man; for the divine origin of the Christian religion does not depend on the truth of the miracles reported to have been wrought in the *second* and *third* centuries, but is sufficiently proved, if it can be made evident that Christ and his apostles had power to suspend the laws of nature. But the discerning reader of the book will perceive, that the author has assailed the

§ 9. I wish that we were fully authorised to place among these miracles, what many ancient writers have recorded concerning a certain legion of Christians in the army of *Marcus Antoninus*, on his expedition against the Marcomanni¹, which by its supplications pro-

miracles of Christ and the apostles, by his attack on those of subsequent date; and that he intended to weaken our confidence in all events which exceed the powers of nature. For, the objections he raises against the miracles of the second and third centuries, are of such a nature as to be readily applied to those of the first. — The substance of his eloquent and learned argumentation is this. All the writers of the three first centuries, whose works are extant, were ignorant of criticism, and not sufficiently guarded and cautious, but sometimes too credulous. Therefore all that they state concerning the miracles of their own times, and even of miracles which they saw with their own eyes, ought to be regarded as a fable. As if it were a conceded point, that no man, unless he is a good critic, can distinguish a true miracle from a false one; and, that *he must always mistake and err*, who sometimes yields his assent sooner than he ought. If this great man had only said, that some of the supernatural events which are reported to have happened in the early ages are very questionable, the position might be admitted: but to aim, by one such general argument, which is liable to innumerable exceptions, and destitute of a necessary and evident conclusiveness, to overthrow the united testimony of so many pious men, and men sufficiently cautious in other things, indicates, if I do not greatly mistake, a mind of high daring, and covertly plotting against religion itself. It is fortunate that this distinguished man, a little before his death (for he died the last year [A.D. 1750]), appears to have learned, from the arguments of his opposers, the weakness of his opinions. For in this last reply, published after his death, namely, *A Vindication of the free Inquiry*, &c. Lond. 1751. 4to., though he is here more contentious and contumelious than was proper, he plainly acknowledges himself vanquished, and surrenders the palm to his antagonists. For he says, he did not mean to affirm, that no miracles were wrought in the ancient Christian Church, after the death of the apostles; on the contrary, he concedes, he says, that God did confirm the truth of Christianity, as occasion required, by repeated manifestations of his infinite power: all that he aimed to show, was, that the power of working miracles *constantly* and *perpetually* was not exercised in the church after the apostolic age; and, therefore, that credit is not to be given to the statements of those ancient defenders of Christianity, who

arrogate such a perpetual power: that is, if I can understand him,—among the doctors of the second and third centuries, there was not one that could work miracles *whenever he pleased*. But this is wholly changing the question. The learned author might have spared himself the labour of writing and defending his book, if this was all he intended when he commenced writing. For, so far as I know, it never came into the head of any Christian, to maintain that there were men among the Christians of the second, third, and fourth centuries, to whom God gave power to work miracles as often as they pleased, and of what kind they pleased, at all times, and in all places. *Bella geri placuit, nullos habitura triumphos.* — Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 221, &c. — Very candid remarks on this subject may also be found in Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* iv. 380, &c., and in Jortin's *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* vol. i. *passim*. Tr.—Tertullian 'asserts, indeed, that Christians possessed the power of expelling dæmons, of curing diseases, of healing the wounds occasioned by the bites of serpents: but he casts a doubt upon the accuracy of his own statement by ascribing to Christians in general those extraordinary gifts, which, even in the days of the apostles, appear to have been confined to them, and to the disciples upon whom they laid their hands.' Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 96. S.]

¹ A.D. 174. [Mosheim's language here, *de legione quadam Christianorum*, is inaccurate. It might lead to a belief that the Roman army then contained a legion wholly Christian. 'Yet even Eusebius does but speak of the *soldiers of the Melitine legion*, which is an ambiguous form of expression; while Tertullian uses the phrase, *Christianorum forte militum precatonibus*, — *Christianorum militum orationibus*, no mention being made of a legion at all, and the word *forte* strongly opposing the idea of the Christians forming an entire body of troops.' (Newman's *Fleury*, i. cxvi.) An account of this matter is to be found in Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 5), but it falls short of positive testimony. The historian merely gives the account as a thing reported. He says of it *λόγος ἔχει*, *the story has it*. He does, indeed, subsequently cite a lost work of Apollinaris, which asserted that the particular legion henceforth bore the designation of *the thundering*, by imperial order, to commemorate this great deliverance by its means. But a legion had borne that designation long before, indeed it seems so far back as the times of Augustus. S.]

cured a shower of rain, when the Roman troops were ready to perish with thirst. But the reality of this miracle is a subject of controversy among the learned: and those who think the Christians to have misjudged in placing that sudden and unexpected shower, which saved the Roman army, among divine miracles, are supported, not only by very respectable authorities, but also by arguments of no little weight.¹

§ 10. It is certain, that the Roman army, when reduced to the greatest straits, was relieved by a sudden shower: and that this rain was regarded, both by the pagans and the Christians, as divinely sent and miraculous: the latter ascribed the unexpected favour to the operation of the people's prayers on *Christ*; while the former attributed it to Jupiter, or Mercury, or to magic. It is equally certain, I think, that many Christians were then serving in the Roman army. And who can doubt that these, on such an occasion, implored the compassion of their God and Saviour? Further, as the Christians of those times looked upon all extraordinary events as miracles, and ascribed every unusual and peculiar advantage obtained by the Romans to their own prayers, it is not strange, that the preservation of the Roman emperor and his army should be placed among the miracles which God wrought in answer to the prayers of Christians. But, as all wise men are now agreed, that no event is to be accounted a miracle, if it can be adequately accounted for on natural principles, or in the common and ordinary course of divine providence, and as this rain may be easily thus accounted for, it is obvious what judgment ought to be formed respecting it.²

¹ The arguments on the two sides of the question may be seen in Herm. Witsius, *Diss. de Legione fulminatrice*, subjoined to his *Ægyptiaca*; he defends the reality of the miracle; and Dan. Laroque, *Diss. de Legione fulminat.* subjoined to the *Adversaria Sacra* of his father Matth. Laroque, who opposes the idea of a miracle:—but best of all in the controversy concerning the miracle of the thundering legion, between Peter King [rather the Rev. Richard King, of Topsham; *Tr.*] and Walter Moyle, which I have translated into Latin, and published with notes, in my *Syntagma Dissertationum ad disciplinas sanctiores pertinentium*. See also P. E. Jablonski, *Spicilegium de Legione fulminatrice*; in the *Miscellan. Lipsiens.* viii. 417, where in particular, the reasons are investigated, which led the Christians improperly to class this rain among the miracles—[See also Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 249, &c.—The most important among the ancient accounts of this matter are, on the side of the pagans, Dion Cassius, *Historia Romana*, lxxi. 8; Julius Capitolinus, *Life of Marcus Antonin.* cap. 24; Ælius Lamprid. *Life of Heliogabalus*, cap. 9; Claudian. *Consulat.* vi. *Honorii* v.—and on the side of the Christians, Tertullian, *Apologet.* cap. 5; *ad Scapulam*, cap. 4; Eusebius, *H.E.* v. 5; and *Chronicon*, p. 82, 215; Xiphilinus, on *Dion Cassius*, lxxi. 9, 10. *Tr.*]

² [‘That during the German war, the Roman army suffered severely from want of water, and was relieved from a situation of great peril by a seasonable shower of rain, is a fact which does not rest on the single authority of Tertullian:’ (who not only asserts that this relief was procured by the prayers of the Christian soldiers, but also that the emperor hence protected Christians, and wrote a letter ascribing the rain to their intercession). ‘It is recorded by several profane writers, and confirmed by the indisputable testimony of the Antonine column. Nor was Tertullian singular in regarding the event as preternatural: the heathen historians did the same. But while Tertullian ascribes the deliverance of the emperor to the prayers of his Christian soldiers, Dion Cassius gives the credit of it to certain magical rites, performed by an Egyptian, named Arnuphis; and on the Antonine column it is attributed to the immediate interposition of Jupiter Pluvius. This latter circumstance completely disproves Tertullian’s statement respecting the existence of a letter in which the emperor ascribed his deliverance to the prayers of his Christian soldiers: a statement, indeed, neither reconcileable with his general character, nor with the harsh treatment experienced by the Christians during his reign.’—Bp. Kaye’s *Tertullian*, 107. *S.*]

§ 11. The *Jews*, first under *Trajan*,¹ and afterwards under *Adrian*² led on by *Bar-Chochebas*, who pretended to be the Messiah, made insurrection against the Romans, and again suffered the greatest calamities. A vast number of them were put to death; and a new city, called *Ælia Capitolina*, was erected on the site of Jerusalem, which not an individual of their miserable race was allowed to enter.³ This overthrow of the Jews confirmed, in some measure, the external tranquillity of the Christian community. For that turbulent nation had previously been everywhere the accusers of the Christians before the Roman judges; and in Palestine and the neighbouring regions, they had themselves inflicted great injuries upon them, because they refused to aid them in their opposition to the Romans.⁴ This new calamity rendered it not so easy for them, as formerly, to do either of these things.

§ 12. The philosophers and learned men, who came over to the Christians in this century, were no inconsiderable protection and ornament to this holy religion, by their discussions, their writings, and their talents. But if any are disposed to question, whether the Christian cause received more benefit than injury from these men, I must confess myself unable to decide the point. For the noble simplicity and the majestic dignity of the Christian religion were lost, or at least impaired, when these philosophers presumed to associate their dogmas with it, and to bring faith and piety under the dominion of human reason.

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1, 2. The persecution of *Trajan* — § 3. That of *Adrian* — § 4. That of *Antoninus Pius* — § 5. That of *Antoninus Philosophus* — § 6. Its calamities — § 7. The reigns of *Commodus* and *Severus* — § 8. Calumnies against Christians.

§ 1. IN the beginning of this century there were no laws in force against the Christians; for those of *Nero* had been repealed by the senate, and those of *Domitian* by his successor *Nerva*.⁵ But it had

¹ A.D. 116.

² A.D. 132.

³ Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 49, 278. [Dion Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* lxi. 12—14. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Justin Martyr, *Apolog.* i. p. 72. *Schl.*]

⁵ [Gibbon also infers from Pliny's celebrated letter to *Trajan*, that when the former accepted the government of *Bithynia*, there were no general laws or decrees of the

senate in force against the Christians, and that neither *Trajan*, nor any of his virtuous predecessors, whose edicts were received into the civil and criminal jurisprudence, had publicly declared their intentions concerning the new sect. If, however, we can attach any weight to the statements of *Tertullian*, the conclusions both of *Gibbon* and *Mosheim* are erroneous. In the first book, *ad Nationes*, *Tertullian* expressly says, that while all the

become a common custom to persecute the Christians, and even to put them to death, as often as the pagan priests, or the populace under these men's instigation, demanded their destruction. Hence, under the reign of *Trajan*, otherwise a good prince, *popular tumults* were frequently raised in the cities against the Christians, which were fatal to many of them.¹ When such a tumult arose in Bithynia, where *Pliny* the younger was proprætor, he thought proper to apply to the emperor for instructions how to treat the Christians. The emperor wrote back that the Christians *were not to be sought after*; but being *regularly accused and convicted*, if they refused to return to the religion of their fathers, they were to be put to death as bad citizens.²

§ 2. This edict of *Trajan* being registered among the public laws of the Roman empire, set bounds indeed to the fury of the enemies of the Christians, but still it caused the destruction of many of them, even under the best of the emperors. For whenever any one had courage to face the danger of accusing, and the accused did not deny the charge, he might be delivered over to the executioner, unless he apostatised from Christianity. Thus by *Trajan's* law, perseverance in the Christian religion was a capital offence. Under this law, *Simeon*, the son of Cleophas and bishop of Jerusalem, a venerable old man, being accused by the Jews, suffered crucifixion.³ According to the same law, *Trajan* himself ordered the great *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch, to be thrown to wild beasts.⁴ For the *kind of death* was left by the law to the pleasure of the judge.

§ 3. Still this law of *Trajan's* was a great restraint upon the priests, who were eager to oppress the Christians; because few persons were willing to assume the dangerous office of accusers. Under *Adrian*, therefore, who succeeded *Trajan*, A.D. 117, they weakened its force by an artifice. For they excited the populace, at the seasons of

other edicts of Nero had been repealed, that against the Christians alone remained in force. In the *Apology*, after having stated that Nero and Domitian were the only emperors who had persecuted the Christians, he says, as we have already seen, that Marcus Antoninus became their protector in consequence of the miraculous deliverance of his army in the German expedition. *Not*, he adds, *that the emperor abrogated the punishment enacted against them, but he indirectly did away its effect by denouncing a heavier punishment against their accusers. What then, our author proceeds, are we to think of laws which none but the impious, the unjust, the vile, the cruel, the trifling, the insane enforce? of which Trajan partly frustrated the effect by forbidding all inquiries to be made after Christians? of which neither Adrian, though a searcher out of all new and curious doctrines, nor Vespasian, though the conqueror of the Jews, nor Pius, nor Verus, called into action?* The whole tenor of this passage manifestly assumes the existence of laws, which though gene-

rally allowed to slumber by the justice and humanity of the emperors, might yet at any moment be converted into instruments wherewith to injure and oppress the Christians. It is evident also from *Pliny's* letter and *Trajan's* answer, that the only offence laid to their charge by the informers was their religion; and that in the estimation both of the emperor and the pro-consul, the mere profession of Christianity constituted a crime deserving punishment.'—Bp. *Kaye's Tertullian*, 117. S.]

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 32.

² *Pliny*, *Epistol.* lib. x. Epist. 97, 98, which epistles many learned men have illustrated by their comments; and especially Vossius, Böhmer, Baldwin, and Heumann. [See *Milner's Hist. of the Ch. of Christ*, century ii. ch. i. Tr.]

³ Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 32.

⁴ See the *Acta Martyrii Ignatiani*, published by Ruinart, and in the *Patres Apostolici*, and elsewhere. [See above, cent. i. pt. ii. c. ii. § 20, note, and *Milner's Hist. of the Ch.* cent. ii. ch. i. p. 138. Tr.]

the public shows and games, to demand with united voice of the presidents and magistrates, the destruction of the Christians; and these public clamours could not be disregarded without danger of an insurrection.¹ But *Serenus Granianus*, the proconsul of Asia, made representation to the emperor, that it was inhuman and unjust to immolate men convicted of no crime, at the pleasure of a furious mob. *Adrian*, therefore, sent a rescript to the presidents, which forbade the putting to death of Christians, unless they were accused in due form, and convicted of offence against the laws; i. e. as I apprehend, he reinstated the law of *Trajan*.² Perhaps also the *Apologies* for the Christians presented by *Quadratus* and *Aristides*, operated favourably on the emperor's mind.³ In his reign, *Bar-Chochebas*, a pretended king of the Jews, before he was vanquished by *Adrian*, committed great outrages on the Christians, because they would not join his standard.⁴

§ 4. Under *Antoninus Pius*, the enemies of the Christians assailed them in a new manner; for, as they were, by the laws of *Adrian*, to be convicted of some *crime*, and some of the presidents would not allow this character to their *religion* merely, they were accused of impiety or *atheism*. This calumny was met by *Justin Martyr*, in an *Apology* presented to the emperor. And that prince himself afterwards decreed, that the Christians should be treated according to the law of *Adrian*.⁵ A little after, Asia Minor was visited with earthquakes; and the people, regarding the Christians as the cause of their calamities, rushed upon them with every species of violence and outrage. When informed of this, the emperor addressed an edict to the *Common Council of Asia*, denouncing capital punishment against accusers of the Christians, if they could not convict them of some *crime*.⁶

¹ [It was an ancient custom or law of the Romans, of which many examples occur in their history, that the people, when assembled at the public games, whether at Rome or in the provinces, might demand what they pleased of the emperor or magistrates, which demands could not be rejected. This right, indeed, properly belonged only to Roman citizens, but it was gradually assumed and exercised by others, especially in the larger cities. Hence, when assembled at the public games, the populace could demand the destruction of all Christians, or of any individuals of them whom they pleased; and the magistrates dared not utterly refuse these demands.—Moreover, the abominable lives and doctrines of certain heretics of this age, brought odium on the whole Christian community; as we are expressly taught by Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 7.—See Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ.* §c. p. 236. *Tr.*]

² See Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 9, and Fr. Baldwin, *ad Edicta Principum in Christianos*, p. 73, &c. [This edict is also given

by Justin Martyr, *Apolog.* i. § 68, 69. It was addressed not only to Minucius Fundanus, the successor of Serenus, but also to the other governors of provinces; as we learn from Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26. *Schl.*]

³ [These apologies are mentioned by Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 3, and Jerome, *Epist. ad Magnum*, Opp. iv. 656, ed. Benedict. and *de Viris Illustr.* c. 19, 20.—From this indulgence of the emperor towards the Christians, arose the suspicion that he himself inclined to their religion. Lampridius, *Vita Alexandri Severi*, cap. 43. *Schl.*]

⁴ Justin Martyr, *Apolog.* ii. p. 72, ed. Colon. [Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* cap. 21. *Schl.*]

⁵ Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 26 [where Melito tells Marcus Aurelius, that his father (Anton. Pius) wrote to the Larisseans, the Thessalonians, the Athenians, and to all the Greeks, not to molest the Christians. *Schl.*]

⁶ [Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 13; but see note above, cent. ii. p. i. c. i. § 3. *Ed.*]

§ 5. *Marcus Antoninus*, the philosopher, whom most writers extol immoderately for his wisdom and virtue, did not indeed repeal this decree of his father, and the other laws of the preceding emperors; but he listened too much to the enemies of the Christians, and especially to the philosophers, who accused them of the most horrid crimes, and particularly of impiety, of Thyestean feasts, and Œdipodean incest. Hence no emperor, after the reign of *Nero*, caused greater evils and calamities to light on Christians than this eminently wise *Marcus Antoninus*; nor was there any emperor, under whom more *Apologies* for the Christians were drawn up, of which those by *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, and *Tatian* are still extant.¹

§ 6. In the first place, this emperor issued unjust edicts against the Christians, whom he regarded as vain, obstinate, void of reason, ignorant of virtue:² yet the precise import of these edicts is not now known. In the next place, he allowed the judges, when Christians were accused of the crimes already specified, by slaves, and the vilest of persons, to put their prisoners to the torture; and, notwithstanding their most constant denial of the charges alleged against them, to inflict on them capital punishments. For, as the laws would not allow the Christians to be executed without a crime, judges who wished them ill were under the necessity of fixing some crime upon them by one way or other. Hence, under this emperor, not only were several very excellent men most unjustly put to death (among whom were *Polycarp*, the pious bishop of Smyrna, and the celebrated philosopher *Justin*, surnamed *Martyr*³), but also several Christian churches, and especially those of Lyons and Vienne in France, A.D. 167, were by his order nearly destroyed and obliterated, by various kinds of executions.⁴

§ 7. Under the reign of *Commodus*, his son,⁵ if we except a few

¹ [Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ. &c.* p. 244, characterises *Marcus Antoninus* as a well-disposed but superstitious man, a great scholar, but an indifferent emperor. His persecutions of the Christians arose from his negligence of business, his ignorance of the character of Christians and of Christianity, and from his easy credulity and acquiescence in the wishes of others.—His character is also given by Milner, *Hist. of the Church*, cent. ii. ch. iv., and very elaborately by A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. 154, &c. *Tr.*]

² See Melito, as quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* i. iv. c. 26.

³ The *Acta Martyrii* of both *Polycarp* and *Justin Martyr* are published by Ruinart, in his *Acta Martyr. sincera*. [The former also, in the *Patres Apostol.* The life and martyrdom of *Polycarp* are the subject of the 5th chapter of Milner's *Hist. of the Ch.* century ii. vol. i. p. 178, &c. ed. Boston, 1822, as those of *Justin Martyr* are of ch. iii. of the same, p. 161, &c. *Tr.*]

⁴ See the Letter of the Christians at Lyons, giving account of this persecution, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. cap. 2. [‘The Christians of Lyons and Vienne appear to have been a religious colony from Asia Minor, or Phrygia, and to have maintained a close correspondence with those distant communities.’ (Milman’s *Hist. of Christianity*, ii. 193.) ‘The fanatical rage of the people in these cities resembled, if it did not exceed, that of the people of Smyrna, and there was here also the additional circumstance, that the superior officers of government were infected with this fury.’ (Rose’s *Neander*, i. 110.) The most illustrious victim was Pothinus, bishop of Lyons, a man of ninety, sinking under infirmity and sickness, but whose pious energy was unsurpassable, when dragged before the tribunal. He was not, however, formally put to death in this persecution. After being beaten, and used in the most violent manner, he was cast into prison, where he died in the course of two days. *S.*]

⁵ A.D. 180—192.

instances of suffering for the renunciation of paganism, no great calamity befell the Christians.¹ But when *Severus* was placed on the throne near the close of the century, much Christian blood was shed in Africa, Egypt, and other provinces. This is certain, from the testimonies of *Tertullian*,² *Clemens Alexandrinus*,³ and others; and those must mistake the fact who say, that the Christians enjoyed peace under *Severus*, up to the time when he enacted laws that exposed them to the loss of life and property, which was in the beginning of the next century. For, as the laws of the [former] emperors were not abrogated, and among these, the edicts of *Trajan* and *Marcus Antoninus* were very unjust; it was in the power of the presidents to persecute the Christians with impunity whenever they pleased. These calamities of the Christians, near the end of this century, induced *Tertullian* to compose his *Apologeticus* and some other works.⁴

§ 8. It will appear less unaccountable, that so holy a people as the Christians should suffer so much persecution, if it be considered, that the patrons of the ancient superstition continually assailed them with their railings, calumnies, and libels. Their reproaches and calumnies, of which we have before spoken, are recounted by the writers of the Apologies. The Christians were attacked, in a book written expressly against them, by *Celsus*, the philosopher; whom *Origen*, in his confutation of him, represents as an Epicurean, but whom we, for substantial reasons, believe to have been a Platonist of the sect of *Ammonius*.⁵ This miserable caviller deals in slander, as *Origen's* answer to him shows. And he does not so much attack the Christians, as play off his wit, which is not distinguished for elegance and refinement. *Fronto*, the rhetorician, also made some attempts against the Christians; but these have perished, with the exception of a bare mention of them by *Minutius Felix*.⁶ To these

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* lib. v. cap. 24, and 16, 18, 19.

² [Tertullian, *ad Scapulam*, cap. 4, and *Apologet.* cap. 5, which show that Severus himself was, at first, favourable to the Christians. But the same *Apologet.* cap. 35, 49, 7, 12, 30, 37, shows that Christians suffered before the enactment of the laws. *Schl.*]

³ [Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* l. ii. p. 494. *Schl.* — See also the account of the martyrs of Scillita in Africa, A.D. 200, in Ruinart's *Acta Martyr.* Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 200, and Milner, *Hist. of the Ch.* vol. i. p. 236. *Tr.*]

⁴ I have expressly treated of this subject in my *Diss. de vera ætate Apologetici Tertulliani et initio persecutionis Severi*; which is the first essay in my *Syntagma Diss. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent.*

⁵ [See Mosheim's preface to the German translation of Origen's work. *Tr.* — Celsus seems to have lived before Ammonius, but may have anticipated some of the peculiarities of his school. He was, perhaps,

an Epicurean, assuming, for the purpose of attack, the character of a Platonist. See Robertson, i. 59; Gieseler, i. 122. *Ed.*]

⁶ Minutius Felix, *Octavius*, p. 266, ed. Herald. — [Minutius mentions this calumniator in two passages, namely, chap. 10, p. 99, and chap. 31, p. 322; in the former of which, he calls him *Cirtensis noster*; implying, that he was of Cirta, in Africa: in the latter passage, he speaks of him as an *orator*, indicating what profession he followed. It has been supposed by the learned, and not without reason, that this Fronto was Cornelius Fronto, the rhetorician, who instructed Marcus Antoninus in eloquence (and whose works were first published A.D. 1816, by Ang. Maius, Frankf. on Mayn, in two parts). So long as the Christian community was made up of unlearned persons, the philosophers despised them. But when, in the second century, some eminent philosophers became Christians, as Justin, Athenagoras, Pantænus, and others, who retained the name, garb, and mode of living of philosophers, and who became

may be added *Crescens*, a Cynic philosopher, who, though he seems to have written nothing against the Christians, yet was very eager to do them harm; and in particular did not cease to persecute *Justin Martyr*, till he compassed his death.¹

teachers of youth, and while they gave a philosophical aspect to Christianity, exposed the vanity of the pagan philosophy, and the shameless lives of those addicted to it; the pagan philosophers, perceiving their reputations and their interests to be at stake, now joined the populace and the priests in persecuting the Christians in general; and they especially assailed the Christian philosophers, with their calumnies and accusations. Their chief motive was not the love of truth, but their own reputation, influence, glory, worldly interest and advantage; just

the same causes as had before moved the pagan priests. This war of the philosophers commenced in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, who was himself addicted to philosophy. And it is easy to see what induced him to listen to his brother philosophers, and, at their instigation, to allow the Christians to be persecuted. See Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ. &c.* p. 256, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ Justin Martyr, *Apologia*, ii. p. 21, ed. Oxon. Tatian, *Orat. contra Græcos*, p. 72, ed. Worthii.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of learning in general — § 2, 3. Learned men — § 4. Rise of the new Platonics — § 5. Eclectics at Alexandria — § 6. Approved by the Christians — § 7. Ammonius Saccas — § 8. His fundamental principles — § 9. His principal doctrines — § 10. His austere system of moral discipline — § 11. His opinions concerning God and Christ — § 12. Ill effects of this philosophy on Christianity — § 13. The state of learning among Christians.

§ 1. LITERATURE, although it seemed in some measure to recover its former dignity and lustre during the reign of *Trajan*,¹ could not long retain its influence under the subsequent emperors, who were indisposed to patronise it. The most learned among these Roman sovereigns, *Marcus Antoninus*, showed favour only to the philosophers, and especially to the Stoics; the other arts and sciences he, like the Stoics, held in contempt.² Hence the literary productions of this age, among the Romans, are far inferior to those of the preceding century, in elegance, brilliance, and good taste.

§ 2. Yet there were men of excellent genius, among both Greeks and Romans, who wrote well on almost every branch of learning then cultivated. Among the Greeks, *Plutarch* was particularly eminent. He was a man of various but ill-digested learning; and besides was tainted with the principles of the academics. Rhetoricians, logicians, and grammarians had schools in all the more considerable towns of the Roman empire: in which they pretended to train up youth for public life, by various exercises and declamations. But those educated in these schools were vain, loquacious, and formed for display, rather than truly eloquent, wise, and competent to transact business. Hence the sober and considerate looked with contempt on the education acquired under these teachers. There were two public academies; one at *Rome*, founded by *Adrian*, in which all branches

¹ Pliny, *Epistolar.* lib. iii. Ep. 18, p. 234, 235, ed. Cortii et Longolii.

² M. Antoninus, *Meditations*, or, *Ad se*

ipsum, lib. i. § 7, p. 3, 4, § 17, p. 17, ed. Lips.

of learning were taught, but especially jurisprudence; the other at *Berytus*, in Phœnicia, in which jurists were principally educated.¹

§ 3. Many philosophers, of all the different sects, flourished at this time; but to enumerate them belongs rather to other works than to this.² The Stoic sect had the honour of embracing two great men, *Marcus Antoninus*, the emperor, and *Epictetus*.³ But each of these had more admirers than disciples and followers; nor do the Stoics appear from books to have stood very high among philosophers in this age. There were larger numbers in the schools of the Platonists; among other reasons, because they were less austere, and their doctrines accorded better with the prevailing opinions about the gods. But no sect appears to have numbered more adherents than the Epicureans; whose precepts led to an indulgent, careless, and voluptuous life.⁴

§ 4. Near the close of this century a new philosophic body suddenly started up, which in a short time prevailed over a large part of the Roman empire, and not only nearly swallowed up the other sects, but likewise did immense injury to Christianity.⁵ Egypt was its birth-place, and particularly Alexandria, which for a long time had been the seat of literature and every science. Its followers chose to be called *Platonics*. Yet they did not follow *Plato* implicitly, but collected from all systems whatever seemed to coincide with their own views. And the ground of this preference for the name of *Platonics* was, that they conceived *Plato* to have understood more correctly than any one besides, that most important branch of philosophy, which treats of God, and things remote from sensible apprehension.

§ 5. That controversial spirit in philosophy, which exacted from disciples implicit acquiescence in the decisions of a single master, was now disapproved by the more wise. Hence among lovers of truth, and men of moderation, a new class of philosophers had grown up in Egypt, who avoided altercation and a sectarian spirit, and who professed simply to follow the truth, gathering up whatever was accordant with it, in all the philosophic schools. They assumed therefore the name of *Eclectics*. But, notwithstanding these philosophers were really the partisans of no sect, yet it appears, from a variety of testimonies, that they much preferred *Plato*, and embraced most of his dogmas concerning God, the human soul, and the universe.⁶

§ 6. This philosophy was adopted by such of the learned at Alexandria, as wished to be accounted Christians, and yet to retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers. In particular, all those

¹ M. Antoninus, *Meditations*, or, *Ad se ipsum*, i. 7, 10, 17, p. 4, 7, 16, ed. Lips.

² Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Trypho*. Opp. p. 218, &c. Many of the philosophers of this age are mentioned by M. Antoninus, *Meditat. or, Ad se ipsum*, lib. i.

³ [Concerning M. Antoninus, see Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 578, and for Epictetus, *ibid.* p. 568. *Schl.*—Stæudlin, *Gesch. der Moral Philos.* p. 265, &c. treats of M. Antoninus; and *ibid.* p. 260, &c. of Epictetus. *Tr.*]

⁴ Lucian, *Pseudomantis*; Opp. i. 763.

⁵ [See Mosheim's *Commentat. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia*, in his *Syntagma Diss. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent.* i. 85, &c.; and Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. p. 162, &c. *Schl.*—And, on the contrary, C. A. T. Keil, *Exercitatt.* xviii. de *Doctoribus veteris eccles. culpâ corruptæ per Platonicas sententias theologâ, liberandis*, Lips. 1793—1807, 4to. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 189, &c. *Schl.*]

who in this century presided in the schools of the Christians at Alexandria, *Athenagoras*, *Pantænus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, are said to have approved of it.¹ These men were persuaded that true philosophy, the great and most salutary gift of God, lay in scattered fragments among all the sects of philosophers; and therefore, that it was the duty of every wise man, and especially of a Christian teacher, to collect those fragments from all quarters, and to use them for the defence of religion and the confutation of impiety. Yet this selection of opinions did not prevent them from regarding *Plato* as wiser than all the rest, and as especially remarkable for treating the Deity, the soul, and things remote from sense, so as to suit the Christian scheme.²

§ 7. This [eclectic] mode of philosophizing received some modification, when *Ammonius Saccas*, at the close of the century, with great applause, opened a school at Alexandria, and laid the foundation to that sect which is called the *New Platonic*. This man, originally a Christian, and perhaps a pretender to Christianity all his life,³ being

¹ The title and dignity of philosopher so much delighted those good men, that, when made presbyters, they would not abandon the philosopher's cloak and dress. See Origen's letter to Eusebius, Opp. i. 2, ed. De la Rue. [Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Trypho. initium*. For proof that Pantænus studied philosophy, see Origen, in Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 19. Jerome, *de Scriptoribus Illustr.* c. 20. The proficiency of Athenagoras in philosophy appears from his *Apology*, and his *Essay on the Resurrection*. That Clemens Alex. was much addicted to philosophy, is very evident; see his *Stromata*, passim.—Concerning the Alexandrian Christian school, see Herm. Conringius, *Antiquitates Academicæ*, p. 29. J. A. Schmidt, Diss. prefixed to A. Hyperii *Libellus de Catechesi*: Domin. Aulisius, *delle Scuole Sacre*, lib. ii. cap. 1, 2, 21. Geo. Langemäck, *Historia Catechismorum*, pt. i. p. 86.—See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 273, &c. Tr.]

² [This cultivation of philosophy by Christian teachers greatly displeased those who were attached to the ancient simple faith, as taught by Christ and his apostles; for they feared what afterwards actually happened, that the purity and excellence of divine truth would suffer by it. Hence the Christians were divided into two parties, the friends of philosophy and human learning, and the opposers of them. The issue of the long contest between them was, that the advocates of philosophy prevailed.—Traces of this controversy may be seen in Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 28, and in Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* i. 1—5.—See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* p. 276, &c. Tr.]

³ [The history of Ammonius is obscure. All that could be gathered from antiquity respecting him is given by Brucker, *His-*

toria Crit. Philos. ii. 205. See also J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. iv. c. 26. Whether Ammonius continued a professed Christian, or apostatised, has been much debated. Porphyry, who studied under Plotinus, a disciple of Ammonius (as quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 19), says, that he was born of Christian parents, but when he came to mature years, embraced the religion of the laws; i. e. the pagan religion. Eusebius taxes Porphyry with falsehood in this; and says that Ammonius continued a Christian till his death, as appears from his books, one of which was on the accordance of Moses with Jesus Christ. Jerome, *de Scriptoribus Illustr.* cap. 55, says nearly the same. Valesius, Bayle, Basnage, and Dr. Mosheim (when he wrote his essay de *Ecclesia turbata per recentiores Platonicos*), agreed with Eusebius and Jerome. But Dr. Mosheim, when he wrote his *Commentarii de Rebus Christ.*, fell in with the opinion of Fabricius, Brucker, and others, (and which is now the general opinion,) that Eusebius and Jerome confounded Ammonius the philosopher with another Ammonius, the reputed author of a harmony of the Gospels, and other works; because it can hardly be supposed this enthusiastic admirer of philosophy would have found time or inclination for composing such books. Besides, it is said, Ammonius the philosopher published no books. Still the question remains, what were the religious character and creed of this philosopher in his maturer years? Dr. Mosheim thinks it probable he did not openly renounce Christianity, but endeavoured to accommodate himself to the feelings of all parties; and, therefore, he was claimed by both pagans and Christians. Hence, if he was a Christian, he was a very

recommended by great fecundity and extent of genius, undertook to bring all systems of philosophy and religion into harmony. In other words, he was bold enough to broach a philosophic system which should embrace and join together all the philosophers, and every religion, the Christian not excepted. And here, especially, lies the difference between this new sect and the *eclectic* philosophy which had before flourished in Egypt. For the *Eclectics* held that there was a *mixture* of good and bad, true and false, in all the systems; and therefore they *selected* out of all what appeared to them consonant with reason, and rejected the rest. But *Ammonius* held that all sects professed *one and the same system* of truth, however they might differ in their *mode of stating* it, and in certain minute opinions; so that by means of suitable explanations, they might with little difficulty be brought into one body.¹ He moreover held this new and singular principle, that the prevailing religions, and the Christian also, must be understood and explained according to this common philosophy of all the sects, and that not only the fables of the vulgar pagans and their priests, but also the interpretations of the disciples of *Christ*, ought to be separated from their respective religions.

§ 8. The grand object of *Ammonius*, to bring all sects and religions into harmony, required him to do much violence to the sentiments and opinions of all parties, philosophers, priests, and Christians, and particularly by allegorical interpretations, to remove very many impediments out of his way. The manner in which he prosecuted his object, appears in the writings of his disciples and adherents, which have come down to us in great abundance. To make the arduous work more easy, he assumed that philosophy was first produced and nurtured among the people of the East; that it was inculcated among the Egyptians by *Hermes*,² and thence passed to the Greeks; that it was a little obscured and deformed by the disputatious Greeks; but still, that by *Plato*, the best interpreter of the principles of *Hermes* and of the ancient oriental sages, it was preserved for the most part entire and unsullied:³ that the religions received by the various nations of the world were not inconsistent with this most ancient philosophy; yet it had most unfortunately happened, that what the ancients taught by symbols and fictitious histories, according to the oriental fashion, had been understood literally by the people and the priests; and thus the ministers of Divine Providence, those *demons* whom the supreme Lord of all had placed over the various parts of our world, had erroneously been converted into gods, and had been worshipped with many vain ceremonies; that, therefore, the public religions of all nations should be corrected by this ancient philosophy; and that it

inconsistent one, and did much injury to the cause. — See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 281. *Tr.*]

¹ [The views of this sect are very clearly expressed by Julian, who was a great devotee of this philosophy, *Orat. vi. contra Cynicos*, Opp. p. 184. *Schl.*]

² [This appears from the writings of all

his followers, Plotinus, Proclus, Porphyry, Damascius, and others. And the learned, not without reason, conjecture that all the [philosophic] works of *Hermes* and *Zoroaster*, which we now have, originated in the schools of these New Platonics. *Schl.*]

³ [Jamblichus, *de Mysteriis Egyptiorum* i. 1, 2. *Schl.*]

was the sole object of *Christ* to set bounds to the reigning superstition, and correct the errors which had crept into religion, but not to abolish altogether the ancient religions.

§ 9. To these assumptions he added the common doctrines of the Egyptians (among whom he was born and educated), concerning the universe and the Deity, as constituting *one great whole* [*Pantheism*¹]; concerning the eternity of the world, the nature of the soul, providence, and the government of this world by demons, and other received doctrines, all of which he considered as true and not to be called in question. For it is most evident that the ancient philosophy of the Egyptians, which they pretended to have learned from *Hermes*, was the *basis* of the New Platonic or Ammonian; and the book of *Jamblichus*, *de Mysteriis Ægyptiorum*, in particular, shows this to be the case. In the next place, with these Egyptian notions, he united the philosophy of *Plato*; which could be done with little difficulty, by distorting some of the principles of *Plato*, and putting a false construction on his language.² Finally, the dogmas of the other sects he construed, as far as was possible, by means of art, ingenuity, and the aid of allegories, into apparent coincidence with Egyptian and Platonic principles.

§ 10. To this Egyptiaco-Platonic philosophy, the man's powerful genius and fanaticism joined a moral discipline apparently of high sanctity and austerity. He, indeed, permitted the common people to live according to the laws of their country, and the dictates of nature; but he directed the wise, by means of contemplation, to raise their souls, which sprang from God himself, above all earthly things, at the same time weakening and emaciating the body which is hostile to the spirit's liberty, by means of hunger, thirst, labour, and other austerities.³ Thus they might, even in the present life, attain to communion with the Supreme Being, and ascend, after death, active and unencumbered, to the universal Parent, and be for ever united with him. And these precepts, *Ammonius*, like one born and educated among Christians, was accustomed to embellish and express by forms of expression borrowed from the sacred Scriptures, which has caused such language to occur abundantly in the writings of his followers.⁴ With his austere discipline he connected the art of so purging that

¹ [On this principle the whole philosophy of the ancient Egyptians was founded; and on it *Ammonius* erected his system. The book which goes under the title of *Hermetis Trismegisti Sermo de Natura Deorum, ad Asclepium*, which is extant in Latin among the works of *Apuleius* the supposed translator, is evidence of this fact. See also *Eusebius, Preparatio Evangel.* iii, 9, and *Mosheim's* notes on *Cudworth's Intellectual System*, i. 404, &c. And the same fundamental principle is assumed by *Plotinus*, *Proclus*, *Simplicius*, *Jamblichus*, and all the New Platonics. See, for example, *Porphry*, in his *Life of Plotinus*, cap. 2, p. 94. *Schl.*]

² [The principle of the Ammonian and

Egyptian philosophy, that God and the world constitute *one indivisible whole*, it cost him much labour to reduce to harmony with the system of *Plato*; who, as we learn from his *Timæus*, taught the external existence of matter, as a substance distinct from God. See *Proclus* on the *Timæus* of *Plato*. *Schl.*]

³ [See *Porphry*, *de Abstinencia*, i. 27, &c. p. 22—34. *Schl.*]

⁴ [See examples in *Hierocles*, on the *Golden Verses* of *Pythagoras*; and in *Simplicius* and *Jamblichus*. See also *Mosheim's Diss. de Studio Ethnicorum Christianos imitandi*, in *Diss. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent.* vol. i. 321. *Schl.*]

faculty of mind which receives the images of things, as to make it fit for seeing demons, and for performing many wonderful feats by their assistance. His followers called this art *Theurgy*.¹ It was not, however, cultivated by all the philosophers of his school, but only by the more eminent.²

§ 11. That the prevailing religions, and particularly the Christian, might not appear irreconcilable with his system, Ammonius first turned the whole history of the pagan gods into allegory,³ and maintained that those, whom the vulgar and the priests honoured with the title of *Gods*, were only the *ministers* of God, to whom some homage might and should be paid, yet short of the superior homage which was due to the Supreme God;⁴ and then he acknowledged that *Christ* was an extraordinary man, the friend of God, and an admirable *Theurge*.⁵ But he denied that *Christ* aimed wholly to suppress the worship of demons, ministers as they were of Divine Providence; his real object only being to wipe away the stains contracted by the ancient religions:⁶ but he charged his disciples with corrupting and vitiating the system of their master.⁷

¹ [This worthless science is very similar to what has been called *allowable magic*, and which is distinguished from necromancy, or unlawful magic. It was undoubtedly of Egyptian origin. As the Egyptians imagined the whole world to be full of good and evil spirits, they might easily be led to suppose that there must be some way to secure the favour of these demons. See Augustine, *de Civit. Dei*, x. 9. Opp. ix. 187. *Schl.*—*Theurgy* is the science of the gods and the various classes of superior spirits, of their appearing to men, and their operations; and *the art*, by certain acts, habits, words, and symbols, of moving the gods to impart to men secrets which surpass the powers of reason, to lay open the future to them, and become visible to them. This *theurgy*, which goes farther, and rises higher than *philosophy*, was first imparted and revealed to men by the gods themselves, in ancient times, and afterwards preserved among the priests. So it is described in the book which bears the name of Jamblichus, *de Mysteriorum Egyptianorum*, i. c. 26—29. Stæudlin, *Geschichte der Moralphilosophie*, p. 462. *Tr.*]

² [See concerning the moral system of the New Platonics, in all its material parts, Stæudlin, *Geschichte der Moralphilosophie*, p. 435, &c. *Tr.*]

³ [See, for example, Porphyry, *de Antro Nymphar.* apud Homerum, *de Styge*, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Paul Orosius, *Historia*, vi. 1, p. 364, 365. *Schl.*]

⁵ [It cannot be denied that the sect of Ammonius embraced some, who were enemies of Christ and the Christians. The emperor Julian, and some others, are proof of this. But Ammonius himself honoured

Christ. And Augustine contended against some philosophers of his time, who, as followers of Ammonius, honoured Christ, yet maintained that the Christians had corrupted his doctrine; *de Consensu Evangelistarum*, Opp. tom. iii. pt. ii. lib. i. c. 6, § 11, p. 5, and c. 8, § 14, p. 6, and c. 15, p. 8. *Schl.*]

⁶ [Augustine, *de Consensu Evangel.* i. 16, p. 8, and c. 24, p. 18. Yet they admitted that Christ abolished the worship of certain demons of an inferior order, and enjoined upon men to pray to the celestial gods, and especially to the Supreme God. This is evident from a passage of Porphyry, quoted by Augustine, *de Civ. Dei*, xix. 23, § 4, Opp. vii. 430. *Schl.*—This principle applies directly to the saint-worship of Romanists. The better informed among them keep within the bounds which Ammonius approved, the less informed naturally fall into the excesses which he pronounced blemishes of the pagan system. *S.*]

⁷ What we have stated in these sections respecting the doctrines of Ammonius we have collected from the books and discussions of his followers, who are called *New Platonics*. Ammonius himself left no writings; and he forbade his followers from ever publishing his doctrines, but they did not obey him. See Porphyry, *Vita Plotini*, cap. iii. p. 97, ed. Fabricii, lib. iv. *Biblioth. Græca*. Yet there can be no doubt, that all we have stated was invented by Ammonius himself, whom the whole family of the New Platonics constantly affirm to have been the author of their philosophy.—[Dr. Mosheim, in his *Comment. de Rebus Christ.* § 27—32, p. 280—298, has given a more full account of Ammonius and his doctrines, and has

§ 12. This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by *Origen* and other Christians, did immense harm to Christianity. For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion, which were in themselves plain and easy to be understood; and to add to the precepts of the Saviour no few things, of which not a word can be found in the holy Scriptures. It also produced for us that gloomy set of men called *mystics*, whose system, if divested of its Platonic notions respecting the origin and nature of the soul, will be a lifeless and senseless corpse. It laid a foundation, too, for that indolent mode of life which was afterwards adopted by many, and particularly by numerous tribes of *monks*; and it recommended to Christians various foolish and useless rites, suited only to nourish superstition, no small part of which we see religiously observed by many even to the present day. And finally it alienated the minds of many, in the following centuries, from Christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of Christian and Platonic principles combined. And who is able to enumerate all the evils and injurious changes which arose from this new philosophy—or, if you please, from this attempt to reconcile true and false religions with each other?

§ 13. The number of learned men among the Christians, which was small in the preceding century, was larger in this. And yet we scarcely find among them any skilled in rhetoric, dialectics, and eloquence. Most of those, who obtained some reputation among them by their learning, were philosophers; and they, as before stated, followed the principles of the *Eclectics*, and gave *Plato* preference to others. But all Christians were not agreed as to the utility of philosophy and literature. Those who were themselves initiated into the depths of philosophy, wished that many, and especially such as aspired to the office of bishops and teachers, might apply themselves to the study of human wisdom, for the purpose of enabling them to confute enemies of the truth with more effect, and of rendering them better fitted for the guidance and instruction of others. But a great majority thought otherwise; they wished to banish all reasoning and philosophy out of the confines of the church; for they feared that learning might injure piety. At this time, therefore, broke out that unhappy war between *faith* and *reason*, *religion* and *philosophy*, *piety* and *intelligence*, which has been protracted through all succeeding centuries, down to our own times, and which we by all our efforts cannot easily bring to an end. By degrees, those obtained the ascendancy who thought that philosophy and erudition were profitable, rather than hurtful, to religion and piety; and laws were at length established, that no person entirely illiterate and unlearned should be admitted to the office of teacher in the church. Yet the vices of the philosophers and learned men, among other causes, prevented the opposite party from ever being destitute of patrons and advocates. Ample proof of this will be found in the history of the following centuries.

cited, particularly, his chief authorities; but the substance of his statements is contained in the preceding sections, and his most important authorities are referred to in the notes of Schlegel, which are all here preserved. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The form of church government — § 2. Union of churches in a province. Origin of councils — § 3. Their too great authority gave rise to metropolitans and patriarchs — § 4. Parallel between the Jewish and Christian priesthood — § 5. The principal writers.

§ 1. THE form of church government, which began to exist in the preceding century, was in this more industriously established and confirmed in all its parts. One president, or *bishop*, presided over each church. He was created by the common suffrage of the whole people. With the *presbyters* for his council, whose number was not fixed, he watched over the interests of religion, and assigned to each *presbyter* his station. Subject to both bishop and presbyters were the servants, or *deacons*, who were divided into certain classes, because all those duties which management of Christian affairs required, could not well be discharged by them indiscriminately.

§ 2. During a great part of this century, all the churches continued to be, as at first, *independent* of each other, or were connected by no consociations or confederations.¹ Each church was a kind of little state, governed by its own laws, which were enacted, or at least sanctioned, by the people. But by degrees, all the Christian churches within the same province united, and formed a sort of larger society, or commonwealth, which, as is usual with confederated republics, held its conventions at stated seasons, and in them deliberated for the common advantage of the whole confederation. This custom first arose among the Greeks, with whom such confederations of several cities, and the consequent conventions of their delegates, had long been in use. In process of time, when experience had shown its utility, this practice found its way over all the Christian church.²

¹ [Yet by ancient custom, peculiar respect was paid to the churches founded and governed by the apostles themselves; and such churches were appealed to in controversies on points of doctrine, as most likely to know what the apostles had taught. See Irenæus, *adv. Hæres.* iii. 3, and Tertullian, *de Præscript. adv. Hæres.* c. 36. Thus, Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 258. *Tr.*—For additional information, see Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 236. *S.*]

² Tertullian, *de Jejuniis*, c. 13, p. 711, [where we have this very important statement: *Aguntur præterea per Græcias, illa certis in locis Concilia ex universis ecclesiis,*

per quæ et altiora quæque in commune tractantur, et ipsa representatio totius nominis Christiani magnâ veneratione celebratur. From this passage of Tertullian, which was written near the beginning of the third century, Dr. Mosheim (*de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 266, &c.) infers, 1, that provincial councils had not then been held in Africa, nor anywhere except among the Greeks; 2, that councils were considered as human institutions, and as acting only by *human authority*; 3, that the provincial councils were held always in the *same places*—*certis in locis*;—4, that they did not interfere with the *private concerns* of individual

These conventions, in which delegates from several churches assembled for deliberations, were called by the Greeks *Synods*, and by the Latins *Councils*; and the laws agreed upon in them were called *canons*, that is, *rules*.

§ 3. These councils, of which no vestige appears before the middle of this century, changed nearly the whole form of the church. For in the first place, the ancient rights and privileges of the people were, by them, very much abridged; and, on the other hand, the authority and dignity of the bishops were not a little augmented. At first, they did not deny themselves to be the representatives of their churches, and guided by instructions from the people; but gradually they made higher pretensions, maintaining that power was given them by *Christ* himself, to decide upon rules of faith and conduct for the members of his church. In the next place, the perfect equality and parity of all bishops, which existed in the early times, these councils by degrees destroyed. For it was necessary that one of the confederated bishops of a province should be entrusted with some authority and power in those conventions over the others; and hence originated the prerogatives of *Metropolitans*. And lastly, when the custom of holding these councils had extended over the Christian world, and the universal church had acquired the form of a vast republic, composed of many lesser ones, certain head men were wanted for its leaders in different parts of the world, who might manage to keep the whole mass together. Hence came *Patriarchs*, and ultimately a *Prince of Patriarchs*, the Roman bishop.

§ 4. No small honour and profit accrued to the whole order of men who conducted the affairs of the church, from the time when they succeeded in persuading the people to regard them as *successors* of the

churches, which were left to their own management; but conferred only on *greater* matters, or such as were of *common interest* — *altiora — tractantur*; 6, that the attending bishops acted as *representatives of their churches*, and not as men clothed with authority from heaven, by virtue of their office — *representatio totius nominis Christiani*. From Greece, the custom of meeting in councils extended into Syria and Palestine. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23. We have no certain accounts of *any* councils till after the middle of the *second* century. The earliest of which we have authentic notice were those which deliberated concerning the Montanists, about A.D. 170 or 173 (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 16), and the next were those assembled to consider the proper time for Easter. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23.) All these councils are placed by Eusebius, under the reign of Commodus, or A.D. 180 — 192. In the *third* century, councils became frequent. Provincial councils were now held, perhaps throughout the Christian world; and special councils were called as occasion required. Originally these councils had no jurisdiction; but were mere conventions of dele-

gates, met to consider and agree upon matters of common concernment. But they soon began to claim power, to enact and enforce laws, and to hear and decide controversies. And the *bishops*, instead of appearing as the representatives of their churches, claimed authority from Christ, to bind and control the churches. See W.C. Ziegler, on the origin of Synods, in Henkens, *Neuen Magazin*. Band i. St. i. G. J. Planck's *Geschichte der christl. kirchl. Gesellschafts-Verfassung*, period ii. ch. v. vol. i. p. 90, &c. C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Kirchenversamml.* Introd. § 3, 4, and b. i. ch. i. sect. ii. p. 82, &c. ch. ii. p. 118, &c. — Bingham, *Origines Eccles.* vii. 45, &c. and Sir P. King, *Constitution, &c. of the Prim. Church*, ch. 8. Tr.]

[It is obvious that all these conclusions cannot be deduced from the words of Tertullian. Dr. Mosheim, whose theory is here abridged by Murdock, begs the question of the original position of bishops. See Robertson i. 146. There is a good passage on the representative character of bishops in A. P. Stanley's *Lectures on the Eastern Church* (London, 1862), p. 69. Ed.]

Jewish priests. This took place not long after the reign of *Adrian*, when, upon the second destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews lost all hope of seeing their commonwealth restored. The bishops now wished to be thought to correspond with the high priest of the Jews; the *presbyters* were said to come in place of the priests; and the *deacons* were made parallel with the Levites. Those who first drew this parallel between offices so totally different, probably made the misrepresentation, not so much from design as from ignorance. But this idea being once introduced and approved, among other errors resulting from it, I will mention only this, that it established a wider difference between the teachers and the learners, than accords with the nature of the Christian religion.¹

§ 5. Among the doctors of this century, whose writings rendered them particularly famous in after-ages, was *Justin Martyr*, a converted philosopher, who had dipped into nearly every sect in philosophy. He was pious, and possessed considerable learning, but he was sometimes an incautious disputant, and was ignorant of ancient history. We have, among other works of his, two *Apologies* for the Christians, which are justly held in great estimation.² *Irenæus*, bishop of Lyons,

¹ [This comparison of Christian teachers with the Jewish priesthood, among other consequences, led the former to lay claim to *tithes* and *first-fruits*; of which we find mention before the times of Constantine. Perhaps a desire to increase their revenues, which were both small and precarious, led some of the bishops to apply Jewish law to the Christian church. That they claimed *first-fruits*, as of divine right, in this century, is clear from Irenæus, *contra Hæres.* iv. 17 and 34. That *tithes* were not yet claimed, at least in the Latin church, appears from the latter of these passages in Irenæus. Yet in the Greek and oriental churches, tithes began to be claimed earlier than among the Latins; and probably in this *second* century, for the Greek writers of the *third* century, and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (which seem to contain the ecclesiastical laws of the Greek church), mention tithes as a thing then well known.—See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.*, §c. p. 271. *Tr.*—Tithes had been commonly paid among pagans from time immemorial. Their origin, therefore, is not to be sought in the Mosaic dispensation, but in that patriarchal faith which is at the bottom of every religious system. Fixed endowments are, indeed, necessary both for the interests of religion, and the reasonable expectations of its ministers. To found a patrimony for piety in the tenth of human wealth, was an obvious mode of meeting this necessity. See Abp. Potter's *Discourse of Church Government*, Lond. 1707. p. 430. S.]

² [Justin Martyr was the son of Priscus, and grandson of Bacchius, pagan Grecians, settled at Flavia Neapolis (Nablus), the

ancient Sichem, in Samaria. See *Apolog.* i. c. 1. He had successive masters in philosophy, Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and lastly Platonic. He travelled much, and was very eager in the pursuit of knowledge, and especially respecting the Divine Being. When about 23 years old, as is conjectured, and about A.D. 137, he was converted to Christianity, in consequence of being directed by an aged Christian to go to the Bible as the source of true philosophy. He afterwards spent most of his time at Rome; where he lived as a Christian philosopher, and devoted all his talents to the furtherance of the gospel. At last, A.D. 164 or 167, he suffered martyrdom, one Crescens, a pagan philosopher, being his accuser, and on the simple charge of his being a Christian. His writings are numerous, erudite, all of them theological, and all of a polemic character. His style is harsh and inelegant, his temper is ardent and decisive, and his arguments and opinions are not always satisfactory. Yet being the first of the learned divines, and a very zealous and active Christian, he merits our particular attention. His life and writings are described by Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 11, 12, 16—18; Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 23; Photius, *Biblioth.* ccxxxii., and others among the ancients; and by Cave, Du Pin, Longuerue, Maran, Milner (*Hist. of the Ch.* i. 161, &c.,) and others among the moderns.—About A.D. 140, he composed two learned treatises against the pagans: *Cohortatio ad Græcos* and *Oratio ad Græcos*. The substance of the former, which is the largest, is this: 'The Greeks have no sources of certain and satisfactory knowledge of reli-

in France, whose only remaining writings are his five books *against Heresies*, which, though a mere Latin translation from the Greek, are

gion. What their poets state concerning the gods is ridiculous and absurd. Jupiter, for example, according to Homer, would have been incarcerated by the other gods, if they had not feared Briareus. And Jupiter himself betrayed his weakness by his amours. Mars and Venus were wounded by Diomede, &c. Thales derived all things from water; Anaximenes, from air; Heraclitus, from fire, &c. But it is not possible for the human mind to search out divine things; it needs aid from above; it must be moved by the divine Spirit, as the lyre must by the plectrum. This was the fact with the Hebrew prophets; who, besides, were much older than the Grecian poets, lawgivers, and philosophers. Even the heathen writers admit the high antiquity of the Jewish legislation, *e. g.* Polemon, Appion, Ptolemy, Mendesius, Hellanicus, &c.; and Philo, Josephus, and Diodorus Siculus confirm it. An Egyptian king, Ptolemy (Philadelphus), therefore, caused the ancient Hebrew books to be translated into Greek, by 70 men, who were inclosed in as many separate cells: when they had finished their translations, they were found perfectly agreeing, not only in the sense but in the words. Justin himself had seen the vestiges of these cells. The Greeks derived their best thoughts from the Hebrews. Thus, Orpheus, Homer, Solon, Pythagoras, and Plato, are known to have acquired their best knowledge in Egypt. Hence, Orpheus, the Sibyls, Homer, Sophocles, &c., were enabled to write about the unity of God; the judgment after death, &c. When Plato, for instance, says: Virtue must be *given* to men by the Deity, he borrowed the idea from the prophets, and to conceal the fact, he substituted *virtue* in place of the *Holy Spirit*. When he says: Time began with heaven, it is clear that he borrowed from Moses' writings, &c. Since, therefore, the Grecian philosophers themselves confess their ignorance, and the Sibyls direct to the coming of Christ, men should go to the prophets, as to the source of all truth.'—The shorter work, entitled, *Oratio ad Græcos*, is similar in its contents. Indeed, this may serve as a fair specimen of the ground taken by the Christian fathers generally, in their controversies with learned pagans. About A.D. 150, or, as some think, 10 or 12 years earlier, Justin presented his earliest or long *Apology* for the Christians to the emperor Antoninus Pius: and a little before his death, or after A.D. 160, his other *Apology*, an imperfect copy of which is improperly called his *first Apology*. The substance of the larger *Apology*, which is written with

little method, is this: 'Why are Christians condemned merely for their name, without inquiry whether they are malefactors? Let *this* be investigated; then punish the guilty, and let the innocent go free. The Christians are accused of *atheism*; but unjustly. They worship God the Father, the Son, and the prophetic or divine Spirit. They offer indeed no sacrifices; but they believe God requires none. Christians are ridiculed for expecting a kingdom of Christ; but unjustly. The kingdom which they expect is not an earthly kingdom; if it *were*, how could they so cheerfully meet death? Christianity is not so totally unlike everything believed by the pagans. The pagans expect a judgment after death; so do the Christians. The former make Rhadamanthus the judge; the latter, Jesus Christ. The pagans believe that many men were sons of Jupiter; Christians believe that Jesus was the Son of God. The pagans assert that Æsculapius healed the sick in a wonderful manner; Christians assert the same of Christ, &c. The ground of this correspondence lies in this, that the demons, who were the authors of the pagan religion, and to whom the pagan worship is paid, copied beforehand the history of Christ, in order to prejudice the truth. Yet they omitted to copy the *cross*, which is the appropriate sign of the power of Christ (and therefore it is found indispensable in nature, *e. g.* in the yards of a ship). Also by the ascent of Simon Magus to heaven, they sought to imitate the ascension of Christ: and since the Romans themselves have erected a statue to this Simon as a god, they should more readily do the same to Christ. Christianity is *true*. This is demonstrable from the prophecies of the Old Testament. (Here, again, the antiquity of the Old Testament is asserted; and the principle maintained, that the Greeks borrowed from the Hebrews.) Also, the prophecies of Christ, concerning his ascension to heaven, and the destruction of Jerusalem, which have been fulfilled, prove the truth of Christianity. Christ is the *Logos* (the *reason* or *intelligence*), of which all men participate; so that every one who has ever lived according to *Logos* (*reason*) was a Christian. The demons, whose worship is prostrated by Christianity, are the authors of the persecutions against Christians.'—Some points in this *Apology* are here omitted, because contained in the other summaries.

The shorter *Apology* commences with an account of some persecutions; which are ascribed to the malice of the demons. It then gives reasons why Christians do not

a splendid monument of antiquity.¹ *Athenagoras* was no contemptible philosopher; and his apology for the Christians, and his treatise

shun martyrdom: and also, why God permits persecution. 'God entrusted the government of the world to angels: these afterwards apostatised from God, and taking human wives, begat the demons; and by them and their offspring, the human race is now oppressed and ruined. God would, before this, have destroyed the world, had he not spared it for the sake of the Christians. Yet it is to be destroyed hereafter, and by fire.' 'Jesus Christ is superior to Socrates; for no one ever died for the doctrine of the latter. The constancy of Christians under persecution is evidence of their innocence.' These summaries of Justin's *Apologies* are specimens of the ground taken by all the ancient Apologists, whose works have come down to us. Besides the four works now mentioned, Justin wrote a book, *de Monarchia Dei*, proving the divine unity, in opposition to polytheism, by testimonies from the Old Testament, and likewise from pagan writers. The latter part of the book is preserved.—Against the Jews he composed, in the latter part of his life, his *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo*. He defends Christianity against the Jews, chiefly by arguments from the ancient prophecies and types of Christ in the Old Testament. He also wrote a book against Marcion, and another against all the heresies; both of which are unfortunately lost. So are his book concerning *the Soul* (in which he collected the opinions of the philosophers on that subject), and his book entitled *Psalmes*. There are several other works now extant, under his name, which are either doubted or denied to be his: namely, an *Epistle to Diognetus*, and another to Zenas and Serenus; 146 *Questions and their solutions to the Orthodox Exposition of the true Faith* (on the Trinity); *Metaphysical Questions* (Questiones Græcane) and answers; *Questions to the Greeks, and their answers refuted; a confutation of some Aristotelian doctrines, &c.* Justin's works make a considerable folio volume. They were well edited, Paris, 1636, reprinted, Cologne, 1686: but still better in the Benedictine ed. by Prudent. Maran, Paris, 1742. Thirlby's ed. of the *Dialogue*, London, 1722, fol., is good. The two *Apologies*, with those of Tertullian and Minutius Felix, are given in English by W. Reeves, London, 1709, 2 vols. 8vo. *Tr.*—English readers who wish to form an opinion of this father, should read *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr*, by Bishop Kaye. Nor should this work be overlooked by the scholar. *S.*

¹ [Irenæus, who was active during the

last half of this century, was born and educated in Asia Minor, under Polycarp and Papias. About A.D. 150, Pothinus and others went from Asia Minor to Lyons and Vienne in France; and Irenæus, then a young man, is supposed to have been one of those missionaries. He succeeded Pothinus as Bishop of Lyons in 177, and was martyred in 202. While a presbyter he was sent to Rome, by his church, concerning the affair of Montanus. He is supposed to have composed the letter written in the name of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, giving the graphic account of their persecution in A.D. 177. He likewise took an active part in the controversy respecting Easter, A.D. 196; and wrote to Victor, bishop of Rome, on the subject; and also to the presbyter Blastus, who was deposed at Rome during that contest. Eusebius has also preserved part of a letter of his to Florinus, an apostate to Gnosticism, with whom Irenæus had been intimate in his youth. Some other small works of his are mentioned by the ancients. See Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 15, 20, 24, 26; Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* cap. 35.—But the great work of Irenæus is his examination and confutation of the misnamed (*γνῶσις*) knowledge in five books, commonly called *Libri contra Hæreses*. The work is altogether polemic, and is directed particularly against Valentinus, yet so as to be a confutation of all the Gnostics, and a defence of the catholic faith against most of the heretics of that age. The book contains much information respecting the early heretics, their origin, sentiments, and characters; also respecting the state of theological science in that age, the doctrines generally received and taught, and the manner of stating and defending them. But unfortunately, the original Greek is lost, except the extracts preserved by Eusebius, Epiphanius, [Hippolytus], and others; and the Latin translation, which is very ancient, is extremely barbarous, and sometimes scarcely intelligible.—Irenæus was an ardent and sincere Christian, and a discreet and amiable man. He possessed considerable learning and influence. As an interpreter of Scripture, like all the early fathers, he was too fond of tracing allegories.—See, concerning his life and writings, Cave, Du Pin, Massuet (works of Irenæus), the *Acta Sanctorum*. June, tom. v. p. 335. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, i. 51, and Milner, *Hist. of the Ch. century* iii. ch. i. vol. i. p. 215.—The best editions of his works are by Grabe, Lond. 1702, fol., and the Benedictine by Massuet, Paris, 1710, and Venice, 1734, 2 tom. fol. *Tr.*—Upon this father

on the Resurrection of the body, display both learning and genius.¹ *Theophilus*, bishop of Antioch, has left us three books, addressed to one Autolytus, in defence of Christianity, which are erudite but not well digested.² *Clemens Alexandrinus*, a presbyter, and head of the catechetical school at Alexandria, was a man of extensive reading, and especially in the works of ancient authors. This is manifest from the works of his that remain; namely, his *Stromata*,³ his *Paedagogus*, and *ad Græcos Exhortatio*. But he was infected with very great errors, into which he was betrayed by his excessive love of philosophy: nor are his works to be commended for good arrangement and perspicuity of style.⁴ In the Latin language, scarcely any one in this

and his work full information will be found, in *An Account of the Life and Writings of S. Irenæus*, by J. Beaven, Lond. 1841. S.]

¹ [Athenagoras, one of the most elegant and able writers the church has produced, is scarcely mentioned by any of the fathers. Methodius, about A.D. 285, quoted from him (see Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 65); Philip Sidetes, about A.D. 400, gives some lame account of him (in Dodwell's *Diss. on Irenæus*, p. 408); and Photius (*Bibliotheca*), in the ninth century, speaks of him. This is all the fathers tell us. It appears from the title of his Apology, that he was a Christian philosopher of Athens; and that he wrote his Apology in the reign of the emperors Marcus and Commodus.—Philip Sidetes, who is a writer of little credit, says, that he presided in the school at Alexandria, before Pantænus; which is contradicted by Eusebius; and that he was converted to Christianity by reading the Scriptures with a design to confute them, which may be true. Dr. Mosheim, in his *Diss. de vera ætate Apologetici Athenag.* (Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. i. 269, &c.) has proved, that the Apology was written A.D. 177, the very year of the persecutions at Lyons and Vienne. Athenagoras descants on the same topics as Justin Martyr, and employs the same arguments; but his composition is immensely superior as to style and method.—His other work, *de Resurrectione*, is written with equal elegance, and contains the arguments used in that age, to support the doctrine of the resurrection of the body against the objections of philosophers. His works, besides being printed separately by Edw. Dechair, Oxford, 1706, 8vo, are commonly subjoined to those of Justin Martyr; and the best editions are those of Grabe, Lond. 1802, and Massuet, Paris, 1710. Tr.]

² [Theophilus was made bishop of Antioch in Syria, A.D. 168, and died about A.D. 182 or 183. The best accounts of him, by the ancients, are those of Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 20, 23, and Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 25.—He appears to have been a

converted pagan, a man of reading, a decided and active Christian pastor, sound in faith, and zealous for the truth. He is not metaphysical, but still is rather a dry and argumentative writer. He composed a book against Hermogenes; and another against Marcion; and a Commentary on the four Gospels: all of which are lost. His great work, and the only one which has reached us, is his three books, addressed to his pagan friend Autolytus, in vindication of Christianity. Here he takes much the same ground with Justin Martyr and the other Apologists: but he descends more into detail, in his proofs from Scripture and from history. He is fond of allegorical and fanciful interpretations, and on them rests a large part of his arguments. For example: about the middle of the second book he makes (*ἐν ἀρχῇ*) in the beginning, Gen. i. 1, to mean, *by Christ*. The constitution by which vegetables spring up from seeds and roots, was designed to teach the resurrection of our bodies. The dry lands surrounded by seas, denote the church surrounded by enemies. The sun is a type of God, as the moon is of man, that frail changeable creature. The three days preceding the creation of the sun and moon (*τῶτοι εἰσὶν τριὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ*) are typical of the *Trinity* of God, and his Word, and his Wisdom. (This is said to be the earliest occurrence of the word *Trinity* in the writings of the fathers.) The fixed stars, among which the sun moves, indicate righteous and holy men who serve God; and the planets denote heretics and apostates, &c. &c.—Yet the work is not all of this character. It contains much that is instructive and solid, and is written in a plain, familiar style. Tr.]

³ [*Stromata*, or *Tapestry-work*, from the variety of its contents.—Clement's *Stromata* (A.D. 200) was written with a design of converting the learned heathen.' Newman's *Arians*, 53, 74. S.]

⁴ [Titus Flavius Clemens, whether born at Athens or Alexandria, was a pagan in early life, and devoted himself to philo-

century illustrated the Christian religion, except *Tertullian*. He was at first a jurisconsult, then a presbyter at Carthage, and at last a follower of *Montanus*. We have various short works of his, which aim either to explain and defend the truth, or to excite piety. Which were the greatest, his excellences or his defects, it is difficult to say. He possessed great genius, but it was wild and unchastened. His piety was active and fervent, but likewise gloomy and austere. He had a great fund of literature and learning, but he was fickle and credulous, and rather subtle than solid.¹

sophy. He travelled in Greece, in south Italy, in Coele-Syria, in Palestine, and lastly in Egypt, where he was a pupil of Pantænus, the master of the Christian school at Alexandria. Becoming a Christian, he was made a presbyter of the Alexandrian church, and succeeded his preceptor Pantænus, as master of the catechetical or divinity school. He taught with great applause during the reign of Severus (A.D. 193—211), and had Origen and other eminent men of the third century for pupils.—About 202, he retired into Palestine and Syria, for a short time, to avoid persecution. He is supposed to have died about 220.—Clement had vast learning, a lively imagination, great fluency, considerable discrimination, and was a bold and independent speculator. That he had true piety, and held the essential truths of the Gospel, is admitted by all; but no one of the fathers, except Origen, has been more censured, in modern times, for an excessive attachment to philosophy or metaphysical theology. He was a true *Eclectic*, which he also professed to be; that is, he followed no master implicitly, but examined and judged for himself. Yet his education and the atmosphere in which he lived, led him to lean towards Platonism and Stoicism. His great error was, that he overrated the value of philosophy, or human reason, as a guide in matters of religion. He also indulged his imagination, as all the learned of this age did, to excess; and construed the Bible allegorically and fancifully.—His three principal works, which have reached us, constitute one whole. His *Exhortatio ad Græcos* was intended to convince and convert pagans. It exposes the nakedness of polytheism, and demonstrates the truth and excellence of Christianity. His *Pædagogus*, in three books, was intended to instruct a young convert in the practice of Christianity. It is an indifferent performance, dwells much on trivial rules of conduct, and does not go to the bottom even of external morality. His *Stromata*, in eight books (the last of which is not the genuine eighth book), are written without method, or in a most discursive manner. In them Clement attempts to give the world his

most profound thoughts and speculations on theology and the kindred sciences.—He has also left us a practical treatise, entitled, *Quis dives ille sit, qui salvetur?* in which his object is to show to what temptations and dangers the *rich* are exposed. There are ascribed to him, and printed with his works, extracts from the writings of Theodotus and the oriental philosophy (the contents of some one's note book respecting the Gnostics), and selections from the prophets (of no great value), which may be taken from the loose papers of Clement, yet are dubious.—Eusebius and Jerome mention works of his, which are now lost. Of these, the principal are *Libri VIII. Hypotyposeon*, a compendious exposition of the Old and New Testament. The others were tracts: *de Paschate*, *de Jejuniis*, *de Obsecratione*, *Exhortatio ad Patientiam*, and *Canon Ecclesiasticus*, or *de Canonibus Ecclesiasticis*.—The character and writings of Clement have been elaborately investigated by various persons, among whom are N. le Nourry (*Apparat. ad Biblioth. Patr.*), J. G. Walch (*Miscellanea Sacra*), J. Brucker (*Hist. Crit. Philos.*), and A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i.—The best edition of his works is that of Potter, Oxon. 1715, fol. Tr.—Bishop Kaye has rendered ample information upon this Father, universally accessible, in *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*. S.]

¹ Those who wish further information concerning these writers, their defects and their works, are directed—and the direction is given once for all—to consult those authors who treat professedly of the Ecclesiastical Writers; namely, J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca and Biblioth. Latina*. W. Cave, *Historia Litteraria Scriptor. Eccles.* L. Ellies du Pin and Remigius Cellier, in their *Bibliothecas* of Ecclesiastical Writers in French, and others.

[Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus was the son of a pagan centurion of proconsular rank, and born at Carthage about A.D. 160. He was bred to the law; but becoming a Christian, was made a presbyter in the church of Carthage, where he appears to have spent his whole life. About

A.D. 200, he embraced the sentiments of the Montanists, which he afterwards defended with his usual ardour. He is said to have lived to a great age, and yet he is supposed to have died about A.D. 220.—Jerome *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 53. Eusebius, *Chronicon*, ann. 16 Severi, and others, give him a high character. Jerome tells us, that Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, was accustomed to read some portions of his works daily; and in calling for this author, used to say, *Da magistrum, bring my master.* He wrote with great force, and displayed much both of erudition and acuteness; but his style is concise, harsh, and extremely difficult for modern readers. His diction and his spirit, too, it has been supposed, were extensively propagated in the Latin church.—His works consist of about 30 short treatises, and are nearly all of a polemic cast, argumentative, vituperative, and severe. They may be divided into three classes; namely, *apologetic*, or, in controversy with Pagans and Jews;—*doctrinal*, or confutations of heretics;—and *moral*, in defence or confutation of certain practices or rules of conduct.—Of the first class, are his *Apologeticus* and *Ad Nationes Libri II.* These are only different editions of the same work, and were composed about A.D. 198: *de Testimonio Animæ*; the testimony of conscience or common sense to the truths maintained by Christians: *ad Scapulam*, a pagan magistrate; an expostulation with him (A.D. 211): *adversus Judeos*; proving from the Old Testament that Jesus was the Messiah, and Christianity true.—In all these, he takes the same ground with Justin Martyr and the other apologists of that age.—Of the second or doctrinal class, are, *de Baptismo*; against one Quintilla, who rejected baptism altogether: *de Præscriptionibus Hereticorum*; a confutation of all heresies collectively, on general principles: *Libri V. Adv. Marcionem* (A.D. 207), and single books against the Valentinians, Praxeas, and Hermogenes: *Scorpiace*, or *Scorpiacum*, *adv. Gnosticos*, or *de bono martyrii*; that is, an Antidote against the Scorpions, i. e. the Gnostics, who have no martyrs among them: *de Carne Christi*; that Christ truly died on the cross; maintained against the Docetæ: *de Resurrectione*; of the same tenor with the last: *de Anima*; against the philosophers; their notions of the soul confuted. In attacking the heretics, he takes much the same ground with Irenæus.—Most of his works of the third class were written after he became a Montanist, and are in defence of the rigid principles of that sect, or in opposition to the opinions and practice of Christians in general. The two first, however, were written in his early life, and are of a different character; viz. *de Oratione*; on

prayer in general, and the Lord's prayer in particular: *Liber ad Martyres*; designed to comfort and animate them in their dying moments; *de Spectaculis*, and *de Idololatria*; warnings to Christians against attending theatres, and other idolatrous rites: *Libri II. ad uxorem*; warning her against a second marriage, if she should become a widow; and especially against marrying a pagan: *de Penitentia*; on penance and humiliation for sin: *de Patientia*.—All the preceding of this class were probably written before he became an avowed Montanist:—*de Corona Militis*; justifying and commending a soldier who refused a military crown, and was punished for it: *de Velandis Virginitibus*; against the custom of the young ladies appearing abroad unveiled; *de Habitu Muliebri*; reprehension of the ladies for their attention to dress: *de Cultu Fæminarum*; much the same; on their adorning their persons: *de Fuga in Persecutione*; that no one should retire for safety in time of persecution: *Exhortatio Castitatis*, and *de Monogamia*; two tracts on the same subject; namely, the criminality of second marriages: *de Jejunis adv. Psychicos*; against the orthodox, in defence of the Montanist principles about fasting: *de Pudicitia*; that offenders, especially by unchastity, should never be restored to communion in the church: *de Pallio*; against wearing the Roman toga, and recommending, in place of it, the Grecian pallium or cloak.—These are all the works of Tertullian which have reached us. Among his lost works, were seven books in defence of the Montanists; one on the Believer's hope; one on Paradise; and one on Aaron's garments. The best editions of his works are by Rigaltius, Paris, 1634 and 1641, fol., and by Semler, Halle, 1769—73, 5 vols. 8vo., with a sixth vol. by Windorf, containing indices and a Glossary, 1776. [Translation in *Library of the Fathers*, Oxf. vol. 10. *Ed.*]

(Full information upon this Father and the religion of his day, will be found in a work by Bp. Kaye, published while he held the see of Bristol, entitled, *The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the writings of Tertullian.* S.)

Besides the writers above mentioned, whose works have been preserved, there were many others in this century, of whose works we have only extracts preserved by the fathers. Of these, a catalogue, embracing such as are mentioned by Eusebius in his *Eccles. History*, and by Jerome, *de Scriptoribus Illustribus*, is here subjoined.

Papias, bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia, contemporary with Ignatius, in the beginning of the century. He wrote five books, containing traditional accounts of

Christ, his apostles, and others of the primitive times. He is said to have advocated the doctrine of the Millennium. Euseb. iii. 39. Jerome, c. 18. Irenæus adv. Hær. v. 33.

Quadratus, bp. of Athens. He wrote an Apology for the Christians, presented to the emperor Adrian, A.D. 123 or 131. Euseb. iv. 3. Jerome, c. 19.

Aristides, an eloquent Christian philosopher of Athens, at the same time presented an Apology. Euseb. iv. 3. Jerome, c. 20.

Agrippa Castor, contemporary with the two last. He was "a very learned man," and wrote a confutation of the 24 books of Basilides the heretic. Euseb. iv. 7. Jerome, c. 21.

Hegesippus, a converted Jew, who resided at Corinth and at Rome. He wrote, about A.D. 160, five books, now lost, of Ecclesiastical History, from the crucifixion of Christ to his own times. Euseb. v. 8, 22; and iii. 19, 20, 32. Jerome, c. 22.

Melito, bp. of Sardis. He wrote an Apology, besides various short works; namely, *de Pascha* (the time of Easter); *de Vita Prophetarum*; *de Ecclesia*; *de Die Dominica*; *de Sensibus*; *de Fide*; *de Plasmate*; *de Anima et Corpore*; *de Baptismate*; *de Veritate*; *de Generatione Christi*; *de Prophetia*; *de Philoxenia*; a book entitled *Clavis*; *de Diabolo*, *de Apocalypsi Johannis*, *de Corporato Deo*. Euseb. iv. 26. Jerome, c. 24. [Fragments of Melito, and a work which some have supposed to be his *Clavis*, are published in the *Spicilegium Solesmense*, vol. ii. and iii. Ed.]

Apollinaris, bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia, A.D. 170. He wrote an Apology; five books against the pagans; *de Veritate*, Libri ii.; *adv. Cataphrygas*; *adv. Judæos*, Libri ii. Euseb. iv. 27. Jerome, c. 16.

Dionysius, bp. of Corinth, from about A.D. 170. He was an active and influential man, and wrote valuable Epistles to the churches of Sparta, Athens, Nicomedia, Gortyna, and others in Crete; Amastris, and others in Pontus; and to Pinytus, a Cretan bp., and Victor, bp. of Rome. Euseb. iv. 23. Jerome, c. 27.

Tatian, a rhetorician, and disciple of Justin Martyr. After the death of Justin, he swerved from the common path, and became founder of a rigorous sect called Encratites. He flourished about A.D. 170, and wrote an Apology, under the title of *Oratio contra Græcos*, which is still extant, and usually printed with the works of Justin Martyr. He is said to have composed many other works; among which a *Diatessaron*, or *Harmony of the four Gospels*, and a treatise on *Perfection after the pattern of Christ*, are particularly mentioned. Euseb.

iv. 29. Jerome, c. 29. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 12.

Musanus, of the same age, wrote against the Encratites. Jerome, c. 31. Euseb. iv. 28.

Modestus, of the same age, wrote a book against Marcion, which Eusebius says exceeded all other confutations of that heretic. Euseb. iv. 25. Jerome, c. 32.

Bardesanes, a Syrian of Edessa, of the same age, an eloquent and acute reasoner. He was first a Valentinian; but afterwards wrote against that and other sects. His works were numerous, which his admirers translated from Syriac into Greek. His dialogues against Marcion, and his treatise on *Fate*, are particularly commended. Euseb. iv. 30. Jerome, c. 33.

Victor, bp. of Rome, A.D. 194—203. His zeal respecting the right day for Easter, led him to write several Epistles on that subject. Euseb. v. 24. Jerome, c. 34. Nothing of his remains; though two spurious Epistles with his name are still extant.

Pantænus, a Christian philosopher of Alexandria, and head of the catechetical school there, before Clement. He was a learned and active Christian; and wrote much, particularly in explanation of the Scriptures; but none of his works remain. He visited India, or Arabia Felix, as a missionary, and had vast influence in the church. Euseb. v. 10. Jerome, c. 36.

Rhodon, an Asiatic Greek, but educated at Rome under Tatian. He wrote much, and in particular on the *Hexæmeron* (the six days of creation); a treatise against Marcion; and another against the Phrygians or Cataphrygians, the disciples of Montanus. Euseb. v. 13. Jerome, c. 37.

Miltiades, who flourished in the reign of Commodus A.D. 180—192. He wrote an Apology; a work against the Cataphrygians; two books against the pagans; and two others against the Jews. Euseb. v. 17. Jerome, c. 39.

Apollonius, an eloquent Greek writer, author of a long and much valued confutation of the Cataphrygians. Euseb. v. 18. Jerome, c. 40.

Serapion, ordained bp. of Antioch A.D. 191. He wrote an Epistle concerning the Montanists, or Cataphrygians; another to Dominus, an apostate to Judaism; and a tract concerning the spurious Gospel ascribed to Peter. Euseb. vi. 12. Jerome, c. 41.

Apollonius, a Roman senator and martyr under Commodus. His eloquent defence at his trial was committed to writing. Euseb. v. 21. Jerome, c. 42.

Under the reigns of Commodus and Severus, or A.D. 180—211, lived several writers, mentioned summarily by Euseb. v.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Religion yet simple—§ 2. Was gradually changed—§ 3. This proved by an example—§ 4. Attention to the Scriptures—§ 5. Faults of interpreters—§ 6. State of dogmatic theology—§ 7. Polemics of this age—§ 8. Excellences and defects of the controversialists—§ 9. Writers on practical religion—§ 10. Merits of the fathers in regard to practical religion—§ 11. Twofold system of practical religion—§ 12. Hence the Ascetics—§ 13. Causes of their rise—§ 14. Their progress—§ 15. Origin of pious frauds—§ 16. A Christian life, and the discipline of offenders—§ 17. Public penitence modelled according to the rules of the pagan mysteries.

§ 1. THE whole Christian system was still comprised in a few precepts and propositions; nor did the teachers publicly advance any doctrines besides those contained in what is called the *Apostles' Creed*. In their manner of handling these doctrines, there was nothing subtle, profound, or distant from common apprehension. This will not appear strange, if we reflect that no controversy had yet been moved respecting those important points of religion about which contests afterwards arose, and that the bishops were generally plain, unlearned men, more distinguished for their piety than for their genius and eloquence.

§ 2. Yet insensibly, from this venerable simplicity, there was a considerable departure; many points were more critically investigated, and more artificially stated; many principles also, and these none of the solidest, were imprudently transferred from philosophy to the holier system. Of this change the reasons were chiefly two. One lay in the disposition of certain teachers, who wished to make Christianity appear in harmony with the decisions of philosophy, and thought it a fine thing to state Christian precepts in the language of philosophers, civilians, and rabbins. The other came from the discussions with opponents and corrupters of the truth. In studying to meet these, learned men were sometimes driven by the necessities of the case itself, to state with an accuracy hitherto unknown, propositions that had never been defined before, and to keep them within certain limitations.

§ 3. Whoever wishes for an example, need only consider the notions which began to get afloat in this age, respecting the state of souls when separated from the body. *Jesus* and his apostles simply taught that the spirits of holy men on leaving the body were received into

27, and by Jerome, c. 46—51: namely, Heraclitus, author of a *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*; Maximus, who wrote on the *Origin of Evil and the Creation of Matter*; Candidus and Appion, who wrote on the *Hexæmeron* (Gen. ch. i.); Sextus

wrote on the *Resurrection*; and Arabianus composed some doctrinal tracts.

All the preceding wrote in Greek, except Bardesanes, who composed in Syriac, and Victor, and Apollonius the martyr, who wrote in Latin. *Tr.*]

heaven, and that those of the wicked went to hell. And this satisfied the first disciples of *Christ*, in whom there was more piety than curiosity. But this plain doctrine was materially injured, when Christians were induced to agree with the Platonics and others, that only the souls of heroes, and of men, without littleness or grossness, were borne aloft; while others, kept down by a weight of fleshly lusts, went off to the realms below, and did not emerge into light until every stain was purged away.¹ From the time when this opinion began to prevail, the *martyrs* only were represented and believed to be happy immediately after death; to others was assigned some obscure region, in which they should be detained, either till the second coming of *Christ*, or at all events, till stains, which disqualify for heaven, should cling to them no more. Hence, how many and how great are the errors that have sprung! how many the vain ceremonies! how many the debasing superstitions!

§ 4. They all revered the holy Scriptures as the rule of faith and truth; and, therefore, wished them to be in the hands of all. Upon translations of them into other languages, we have already spoken. We shall here speak only of the expositors. The first Christian who composed explanations of the sacred volume, was, if I mistake not, *Pantenus*, the master of the Alexandrian school. But Divine Providence has so ordered, that none of his writings have reached us. The *Hypotyposes*, also, of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, in which he is said to have expounded detached passages from all the sacred books, have been lost; and likewise his *Commentaries on the canonical Epistles*. *Tatian* composed a *Harmony of the Gospels*, which has [not] escaped the ravages of time.² *Justin Martyr* explained the *Apocalypse*; *Theophilus* of Antioch elucidated the *four Gospels*; and [many] others expounded the Mosaic account of the creation. All these works are now lost.

§ 5. But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that of these expositors, no one could be pronounced eminent and luminous. They all believed the language of Scripture to contain *two meanings*: the one *obvious*, and corresponding with the direct import of the words; the other *recondite*, and concealed under the words, like a nut by the shell. The former they neglected, as of little value, their study chiefly being to extract the latter; in other words, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings, by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out the true meanings of them. Some also, and this is stated especially of *Clement*, accommodated the divine oracles to the precepts of philosophy. Expositors of the Old Testament were met at the outset, in the excessive and almost

¹ I have treated largely of these sentiments of the ancients, and especially of the Platonics, in my notes on R. Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, ii. 1036.

² [I cannot but think there must be a great typographical error in the original of this sentence. For it is not easy to believe, that Dr. Mosheim held to the long exploded

notion, that either of those *Harmonies* of the four Gospels, which we have in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, could be the genuine work of *Tatian*. See *Prudentius Maran*, Diss. xiii. c. 12, § 5, 6, prefixed to his edition of *Justin Martyr*, &c., and republished by *Sprenger*, *Thesaurus Rei Patristicæ*, tom. ii. *Tr.*]

divine authority of the Alexandrian version, known as the Septuagint, by an obstacle to the production of any thing praiseworthy and out of the common way.

§ 6. A system of Christian theology, so far as we can learn, was composed by no one in this age. The tracts of *Arabianus*, *de dogmate Christiano*, having been all lost, we cannot tell what they were. The five books of *Papias*, *de Dictis Christi et Apostolorum*, or *Explanatio oraculorum dominicorum*, so far as can be learned from *Eusebius*, must be regarded rather as a historical than a doctrinal work. *Melito* of Sardis is said to have written, *de Fide*, *de Creatione*, and *de Veritate*: but it does not appear from these titles, whether they were polemic or doctrinal treatises. Some points in theology were stated with unusual clearness by those who engaged in religious controversies. But the doctrines which were not brought into dispute are seldom found so distinctly treated by the writers of that age, as to make it quite clear what they thought. It is not, therefore, strange, that all sects of Christians can find in what are called the *Fathers*, something to favour their own systems and opinions.

§ 7. The controversial writers who distinguished themselves in this century, encountered either the *Jews*, or the *worshippers of idol gods*, or the corrupters of the Christian doctrine and founders of new sects, that is, the *heretics*. With the *Jews*, contended in particular *Justin Martyr*, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, and likewise *Tertullian*; but neither of them in the best manner, because they were not acquainted with the language and history of the Hebrews, and did not duly consider the subject. The *pagans* were assailed especially, by those who wrote *Apologies* for the Christians; as *Athenagoras*, *Melito*, *Quadratus*, *Miltiades*, *Aristides*, *Tatian*, and *Justin Martyr*; or who composed *Exhortations to the Gentiles*; as *Justin*, *Tertullian*, *Clement*, and *Theophilus* of Antioch. All these beat down superstition solidly and dexterously, besides exposing the calumnies cast upon Christ's disciples; but they were not equally able and successful, either in explaining the nature of the Christian religion, or in demonstrating its truth and divine origin. At least, we think much wanting in the explanations that they give of Christian doctrines, and in the arguments that they use in confirmation of religious truth. Those who chastised the *heretics* make a numerous body; but we have few of their writings left. The whole host of *heretics* were attacked by *Irenæus* in a work expressly against them; by *Clement* in his *Stromata*; and by *Tertullian*, *de Præscriptionibus adversus hæreticos*; not to mention *Justin Martyr*, whose confutation of them has been lost. Those who wrote against particular sects, it would be tedious to enumerate; besides, most of their works are not preserved.

§ 8. In these disputants there was something more of ingenuousness and good faith, than in those who undertook the support of truth in the following centuries. For the convenient wiles of sophistry, and the dishonourable artifices of debate, had not yet gained admittance among Christians. Yet a man of sound judgment, who has due regard for truth, cannot extol them highly. Most of them lack

discernment, knowledge, good arrangement, application, and force. They often advance very flimsy arguments, and such as were suited rather to embarrass the mind than convince it. One, laying aside the divine Scriptures, from which all the weapons of religious controversy should be drawn, bids us consult the bishops of those churches which were founded by apostles. Another, as if contending about the title or boundaries of lands in a court of law, with an ill grace pleads *prescription* against his adversaries. A third imitates the silly disputants among the Jews, who offered as arguments the mystic powers of numbers and words.¹ Nor are those wholly in error, who think that the vicious mode of disputing which afterwards obtained the name of *economical*, was sometimes used even in this century.²

§ 9. The principal points of moral discipline are treated of by *Justin Martyr*, or whoever it was that composed the *Epistle to Zenas and Serenus*, found among the works of Justin. Others took up particular duties in set treatises. Thus *Clemens*, who gained a distinctive name from Alexandria, wrote tracts on *Calumny*, *Patience*, *Continence*, and other virtues, which have not escaped the ravages of time. But the small pieces which *Tertullian* left in this line of writing, on *Chastity*, on *Flight from persecution*, on *Fasting*, on *Theatrical exhibitions*, on the *Dress of females*, on *Prayer*, and other things, have come safely to our hands. They would be perused with greater profit, were it not for the gloomy and morose spirit which they every where breathe, and the excessively artificial and difficult style in which they are written.³

§ 10. On the degree of estimation due to these, and other ancient writers on the duties of a Christian life, learned men are not agreed. Some hold them to be the very best guides to real piety; others, on the contrary, think their precepts the worst possible, and that moral discipline could not be committed to less qualified guardians.⁴ Competent

¹ Examples may be seen in Ja. Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, iii. 660, 694.

² R. Simon, *Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* cap. ii. p. 21. [To do or to say any thing, κατ' οἰκονομίαν, or οἰκονομικῶς, is to use deception or good policy, rather than fair honest dealing; yet with good intentions, or for a good end. See Suicer, *Thesaur. Ecclesiast.* ii. 459. Tr.]

³ [‘We cannot, among the merits of Tertullian, reckon that of a natural, flowing, and perspicuous style. He frequently hurries his readers along by his vehemence, and surprises them by the vigour, as well as inexhaustible fertility of his imagination; but his copiousness is without selection, and there was in his character a propensity to exaggeration which affected his language, and rendered it inflated and unnatural. He is, indeed, the harshest and most obscure of writers, and the least capable of being accurately represented in a translation.’ Bp. Kaye’s *Tertullian*, 67. S.]

⁴ On this subject in our day the learned and ingenious Jo. Barbeyrac held a controversy with Remigius Cellier, a Benedictine monk. A history of the controversy, with his own opinion of it, is given by J. F. Buddeus, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. iv. § iv. p. 553, &c. Afterwards, Barbeyrac published a more full defence of the severe judgment which he had passed upon the Fathers, under the title of *Traité de la Morale des Pères*, Amsterdam, 1728, 4to, which is well worth reading by those who wish to investigate the subject; yet I think he charges the Fathers with some faults which may easily be excused. [Liberatus Fassonius, a Catholic, published an answer to Barbeyrac in a Latin work, *de Morali Patrum Doctrina*, adv. librum Jo. Barbeyraci, Liburnis, 1767, 4to. Fassonius excuses the Fathers for the following opinions, charged upon them as errors by Barbeyrac; namely, that they condemned taking interest for money lent; placed too high a value on virginity, and accounted

judges must decide the question for themselves. To us it appears that their writings contain many things excellent, well considered, and well calculated to enkindle piety; but also many things unduly rigorous and derived from the Stoics and Academics; many things vague and indeterminate; many things besides, positively false and inconsistent with the precepts of *Christ*. If one deserve the title of a bad master in morals, who neither sees the proper limitations of Christian duties nor has clear and distinct conceptions of the different virtues and vices, nor discerns correctly those general principles which should keep in check every discussion upon Christian goodness, being, therefore, very liable to talk at random, and blunder in expounding the divine laws; though he may say many excellent things, and make an impression on the mind; then I can readily grant, that in strict truth this title belongs to many of the *Fathers*.

§ 11. In this century there was admitted, with good intentions no doubt, yet most inconsiderately, a principle in morals radically false, and most injurious to the Christian cause, but one that has through every age, even to our own, been infinitely prolific in errors and ills of various kinds. *Jesus* our Saviour prescribed one standard and rule of living to all his disciples. But the Christian doctors, either by too great a desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or from a natural propensity to austerity and gloom (which is a disease that many labour under in Syria, Egypt, and other provinces of the East), were induced to maintain that *Christ* had prescribed a *twofold rule of holiness and virtue*; the one ordinary, the other extraordinary; the one lower, the other higher; the one for men of business, the other for persons of leisure, and such as sought to attain higher glory in the future world. They therefore early divided all that had been taught, whether in books or by tradition, respecting human life and morals, into *Precepts* and *Counsels*. They applied the name of *Precepts* to those laws which were universally obligatory, being meant for men of all descriptions; but the *Counsels* concerned only those who deemed it glorious to aim at higher things, and a closer union with God.

§ 12. On a sudden there arose accordingly a class of persons, who professed to strive after that higher and more eminent holiness than common Christians can attain; and who resolved to obey the *counsels* of *Christ*, in order to enjoy intimate communion with God in this life, and on leaving the body to rise without impediment or difficulty to the celestial world. They thought many things forbidden to them, which were allowed to other Christians; such as wine, flesh, matrimony, and worldly business.¹ They supposed that they must

celibacy a more holy state than matrimony; forbade husbands sleeping with their wives while pregnant; deemed it unsuitable for clergymen to marry, and excluded from the ministry such as married a second time; commended a monastic life; made two systems of duty, one for the more perfect, and another for common Christians; and

held it lawful to persecute heretics with fire and sword. Most of the other faults charged on the Fathers by Barbeyrac, Fassonius maintains should be charged solely on the heretics. *Tr.*]

¹ Athenagoras, *Apologia pro Christianis*, cap. 28, p. 129, ed. Oxon. and others.

emaciate their bodies with watching, fasting, toil, and hunger. They considered it a happiness to retire into desert places, and by close meditation to abstract their minds from external objects and sensual delights. Both men and women imposed these hard conditions on themselves, with good intentions, I believe, but the example was bad, and did great harm to the Christian cause. They thus obtained the names of *Ascetics*, *Σπουδαῖοι*, *Ἐκλεκτοὶ*, *philosophers*, and even *she-philosophers*; nor were they distinguished from other Christians only by a different appellation, but also by peculiarities of dress and demeanour.¹ Those of this century, who embraced this austere mode of life, lived indeed entirely upon a system of their own, but they did not withdraw themselves altogether from the society and converse of men. In process of time, however, such persons retired into deserts; afterwards they formed themselves into associations, taking pattern from the *Essenes* and *Therapeutæ*.

§ 13. The causes of this institution are obvious. First, the Christians did not like an appearance of inferiority to the Greeks, Romans, and other nations; among whom there were many philosophers and sages, who were distinguished from the vulgar by their dress and their whole mode of life, and who were held in high honour. Now among these philosophers (as is well known), none better pleased the Christians than the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans*; who, it appears, recommended *two* modes of living; one for philosophers, wishing to excel the rest of men in virtue, the other for people engaged in the common affairs of life.² The Platonists prescribed the following rule for philosophers: the mind of a wise man must be withdrawn, as far as possible, from the contagious influence of the body; and as the oppressive load of the body, and intercourse with men, are most adverse to this design, therefore all sensual gratifications are to be avoided; the body is to be sustained, or rather mortified, with coarse and slender fare; solitude is to be sought for; and the mind is to be self-collected, and absorbed in contemplation, so as to be detached as much as possible from the body.³ Whoever lives in this manner, shall in the present life have converse with God; and, when freed from the burthen of the body, shall ascend without delay to the celestial mansions, and not need purgation, like the souls of other men. The grounds of this system lay in the peculiar sentiments entertained by this sect of philosophers and by their friends respecting the *soul*, *demons*, *matter*, and the *universe*. And when these sentiments were embraced by the more learned Christians, the necessary consequences of them followed as a matter of course.

¹ See C. Salmasius, *Comment. in Tertulian. de Pallio*, p. 7, 8. [Sam. Deyling, *Exercit. de Ascetis Vet. in Observ. Sacr.* l. iii. and Bingham, *Antiq.* vol. iii. p. 3, &c. Tr.]

² They made a distinction between living according to nature (*ἔνν κατὰ φύσιν*), and living above nature (*ἔνν ὑπὲρ φύσιν*). See Æneas Gazæus, in *Theophrasto*, p. 29,

ed. Barthii. The former was the rule of all men; the latter only for philosophers who aimed at perfect virtue.

³ Consult here, by all means, that most distinguished Platonist, Porphyry, *περὶ ἀποχῆς*, or *on Abstinence from flesh*, i. § 27 and 41, p. 22, 34, where he formally lays down rules for these duties of a philosopher.

§ 14. What has been stated will excite less surprise, if it be remembered that *Egypt* was the land in which this mode of life had its origin. For this country, from some law of nature, has always produced a greater number of gloomy and hypochondriac or melancholy persons than any other;¹ and it still does so. Here it was that, long before the Saviour's birth, not only the *Essenes* and *Therapeutæ*,—those Jewish sects, composed of persons affected with a morbid melancholy, or rather partially deranged,—had their chief residence; but many others also, that they might better please the gods, withdrew themselves, as by the instinct of nature, from commerce with men and from all the pleasures of life.² From Egypt, this mode of life passed into Syria and the neighbouring countries; which, in like manner, always abounded with unsociable and austere individuals:³ and at last it was introduced from the East among the nations of Europe. Hence the numerous maladies which still deform the Christian world; hence the celibacy of the clergy; hence the numerous herds of monks; hence the two species of life, the *theoretical* and *mystical*; hence the many other things of a like nature, which we shall have occasion to mention in the progress of our work.

§ 15. Another error among the Christians, not indeed of equal extent, but a pernicious one, and productive of many evils, was the following. The Platonists and Pythagoreans deemed it not only lawful, but also commendable, to deceive and lie for the sake of truth and piety.⁴ The Jews living in Egypt learned from them this sentiment before the Christian era, as appears from many proofs. And from both, this vice early spread among the Christians. Of this no one will doubt who calls to mind the numerous forgeries of books under the names of eminent men, the Sibylline verses,⁵ and I know not what besides,⁶ a large mass of which appeared in this age and subsequently. I would not say that the orthodox Christians forged

¹ See Bened. Maillet, *Description de l'Égypte*, ii. 57, &c. Paris, 1735, 4to.

² Herodotus, lib. ii. p. 104, ed. Gronov. Epiphanius, *Expos. Fidei*, § 11. Opp. ii. 1092. Tertullian, *de Exhortatione Castitatis*, cap. 13. Athanasius, *Vita Antonii*, Opp. ii. 453.

³ Jo. Chardin, *Voyages en Perse*, iv. 197, ed. Amsterd. 1735, 4to.

⁴ [Mosheim, on this subject, in his *Comment. de Reb. Christ. &c.* p. 231, refers us to his *Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia*, § 41, &c. Tr.]

⁵ [Concerning the Sibylline verses, which were composed about A.D. 138, J. A. Fabricius has treated largely, *Biblioth. Græca*, t. i. Servat. Gallæus corrected the text, and added copious notes, Amsterd. 1689, 4to. He subjoined the *Magis Oracles* ascribed to Zoroaster and others; in which are many things of Christian origin. That the Sibylline verses were fabricated by some Christian, in order to bring idolaters to believe in the truth of Christianity, has

been well shown by Dav. Blondel in a work first published under the title, *Des Sibyllles célébrées tant par l'Antiquité payenne, que par les saints Pères*, Charenton, 1649, 4to. Two years after the title was changed, doubtless to allure purchasers; *Traité de la Créance des Pères touchant l'Etat des âmes après cette vie, &c., à l'occasion de l'Ecrit attribué aux Sibyllles*, Charenton, 1651, 4to. That the pagans were indignant at this forgery, which they attributed to the Christians, appears from Origen, *contra Celsum*, lib. v. p. 272, ed. Spencer; Lactantius, *Instit. Divinor.* iv. 14; and Constantine the Great, *Oratio ad Sanctos*, in Euseb. *H. E.* See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 230. Tr.—The latest edition is that of C. Alexandre, Paris, 1851–6. Ed.]

⁶ [That the books now circulated under the name of *Hermes*, and particularly the one called *Pemander*, were a Christian forgery, was first shown by Is. Casaubon, *Exercit. i. in Baronium*, § 18, p. 64, and afterwards

all the books of this character; on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated from the founders of the *Gnostic* sects. Yet, that the Christians who were free from heterodox views were not wholly free from this fault, is too clear to be denied.

§ 16. The more the boundaries of the church were enlarged, the greater was the number of vicious and bad men who thrust themselves into it; as may be proved by the many complaints and censures of the writers of this age. The well-known custom of excluding transgressors from the communion, was a barrier against the more flagrant and notorious crimes. Of all sins, those accounted the most heinous and the greatest were these three, *murder, idolatry, and adultery*; which terms, however, must here be understood in the broadest sense. Those guilty of these crimes, in many churches, lost all hope of pardon; in others they were again admitted after a long, severe, and painful probation.¹

§ 17. It is worthy of particular notice, that this custom of excluding bad characters from the society of Christians, and of not receiving them back except upon good proof of a thorough inward change, was at first a simple process, and attended with very little formality; but by degrees the regulations for it were greatly amplified, and deformed by many rites, borrowed especially from the discipline of the pagan mysteries.² That it was proper for the Christian bishops to increase the restraints upon the licentiousness of transgression, will be readily granted by all who consider the circumstances of those times. But whether it was for the advantage of Christianity to borrow rules for this salutary ordinance from the enemies of the truth, and thus to consecrate, as it were, a part of the pagan superstition, many persons very justly call in question. The more candid will appreciate the good *intention* of those who introduced this sort of rules and ceremonies; all beyond this they will ascribe to human weakness.

by H. Conringius, Beausobre, Cudworth, Warburton, and many others. Some, however, suppose that the books were originally composed by Platonists; and afterwards interpolated and corrupted by some Christian. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* p. 230. *Tr.*]

¹ In this manner, I think, we may reconcile the different opinions of learned men on this subject. See Jo. Morin, *de Disci-*

plina Pœnitentiæ, ix. 19, p. 670, &c. Ja. Sirmond, *Historia Pœnitentiæ publicæ*, cap. i. Opp. iv. 323, and the recent Dissertation of Jo. Aug. Orsi, *de Criminum capitalium per tria priora sæcula Absolutione*, Mediolani, 1730, 4to.

² See Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliographie Antiquaria*, p. 397. Jo. Morin, *de Pœnitentia*, lib. i. cap. 15, 16, &c.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Ceremonies much increased — § 2. Reasons: i. A desire to enlarge the church — § 3. ii. Hope that they would silence calumnies — § 4. iii. Abuse of Jewish terms — § 5. iv. Imitation of the pagan mysteries — § 6. v. Mode of instructing by symbols — § 7. vi. Habits of the converts — § 8. The assemblies for worship — § 9. Contests about the time for Easter — § 10. Their importance — § 11. The Asiatics and the Romans, the principal parties — § 12. Celebration of the Lord's Supper — § 13. Baptism.

§ 1. It is certain, that to religious worship, both public and private, many rites were added, without necessity, and to the offence of sober and good men.¹ For the chief cause of this, I should look at once to the perverseness of mankind; who are more delighted with the pomp and splendour of external forms, than with the true devotion of the heart, and who despise whatever does not gratify their eyes and ears. But other and additional causes may be mentioned, which were clear, undoubtedly, of any bad design, but not of indiscretion.

§ 2. *First*, there is good reason to suppose that Christian bishops multiplied sacred rites for the sake of rendering the Jews and the pagans more friendly to them. Both had been accustomed to numerous and splendid ceremonies from their infancy, and felt no doubt that in them was comprised a portion of religion. When, accordingly, they saw the new religion without such things, they thought it too simple, and therefore despised it. To obviate this objection, the rulers of the Christian churches deemed it proper for them to worship God in public with some increase of ceremony.²

¹ Tertullian, *Liber de Creatione*, Opp. p. 792, &c.

² It will not be unsuitable to transcribe here a very apposite passage, which I accidentally met with in Gregory Nyssen's life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, in the *Works of Thaumaturgus*, as published by Vossius, p. 312, who gives the Latin only: — Cum animadvertisset (Gregorius), quod ob corporeas delectationes et voluptates simplex et imperitum vulgus in simulacrorum cultûs errore permaneret — permisit eis, ut in memoriam ac recordationem sanctorum martyrum sese oblectarent et in lætitiâ effunderentur, quod successu temporis aliquando futurum esset, ut sua sponte ad honestiorem et accuratiorem vitæ rationem transirent. — When Gregory perceived

that the ignorant and simple multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the sensible pleasures and delights it afforded, — he allowed them, in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, to indulge themselves, and give a loose to pleasure (i. e., as the thing itself, and both what precedes and what follows, place beyond all controversy, he allowed them at the sepulchres of the martyrs, on their feast-days, to dance, to use sports, to indulge conviviality, and to do all the things that the worshippers of idols were accustomed to do in their temples on their festival days), hoping, that in process of time they would spontaneously come over to a more becoming and more correct manner of life. [Cf. Bede, *H. E.* i. 30. *Ed.*]

§ 3. *Secondly*, the simplicity of the worship which Christians offered to the Deity, gave occasion to certain calumnies maintained both by the Jews and the pagan priests. The Christians were pronounced *Atheists*, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. For unenlightened persons are prone to estimate religion by that which meets their eyes. To silence this accusation, the Christian doctors thought it necessary to introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of the people; so that they could maintain themselves really to possess all those things of which Christians were charged with being destitute, though under different forms.

§ 4. *Thirdly*, it is well known, that in the books of the New Testament various parts of the Christian religion are expressed in terms borrowed from the Jewish laws, or are in some measure compared with the Mosaic rites. This mode of expressing their thoughts the Christian doctors and writers not only imitated, but also extended still further. In this there was little to censure. But in time, either from inconsideration, or from ignorance, or from policy, the greater part maintained that such phraseology was not figurative, but proper, and accordant with the nature of the things. The bishops were at first innocently called *high priests*, and the presbyters *priests*, and the deacons *Levites*. But in a little time, those to whom these titles were given abused them, maintaining that they stood in the same place, enjoyed the same dignity, and possessed the same rights, that had belonged to those who bore these titles under the Mosaic dispensation. Hence the origin of *first-fruits* and next of *tithes*; hence more *splendid garments*, and many other things. In like manner, the comparison of the Christian *oblations* with the Jewish *victims* and *sacrifices*, produced many unnecessary rites, and by degrees corrupted the very doctrine of the holy Supper, which was converted, sooner, in fact, than one would think, into a *sacrifice*.

§ 5. *Fourthly*, among the Greeks and the people of the East, nothing was held more sacred than what were called the *Mysteries*. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say, that *they* also had similar *mysteries*, or certain holy rites concealed from the vulgar; and they not only applied the *terms* used in the pagan mysteries to Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's Supper, but they gradually introduced also the *rites* which were designated by those terms.¹ This practice originated in the eastern provinces: and thence, after the times of *Adrian* (who first introduced the Grecian mysteries among the Latins),² it spread among the Christians of the West.

¹ Examples are given by Is. Casaubon, *Exercit. xvi. in Annales Baronii*, p. 388. Ja. Tollius, *Insignibus itineris Italici*, Notes, 151, 163. Ez. Spanheim, *Notes* to his *French translation of Julian's Cesars*, p. 132, 134. Dav. Clarkson, *Discourse on*

Liturgies, p. 36, 42, 43, and others.

² Spartianus, *Hadrian*, c. 13, p. 15 ed. Obrechtii. [Spartian speaks only of the Eleusinian Mysteries, into which Adrian was initiated at Athens. These it may be that Adrian first introduced among the

A large part, therefore, of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries.

§ 6. *Fifthly*, many ceremonies took their rise from the custom of the Egyptians, and of almost all the eastern nations, of conveying instruction by *images*, *actions*, and sensible *signs*. The Christian doctors, therefore, thought it likely to help their cause, if things which men must know in order to salvation were placed, as it were, *before the eyes* of the unreflecting multitude, who with difficulty contemplate abstract truths. The new converts were to be taught, that those are *born again* who are initiated by baptism into the Christian worship, and that they ought to exhibit in their conduct the innocence of infants; therefore *milk* and *honey*, the common food of little children, were given to them. Those who obtained admission to the kingdom of *Christ*, from being the servants of the devil, became the Lord's freed men; and, like newly enlisted soldiers, swore to obey their commander. And, therefore, certain rites were borrowed from military usages, and from the forms of manumission.¹

§ 7. *Lastly*, not to be tedious: whoever considers that the Christians were collected from among the Jews and from the pagan nations, who were accustomed, from their earliest years, to various ceremonies and superstitious rites, and that the habits of early life are very hard to be laid aside, will perceive that it would have been little short of a miracle if nothing corrupt and debasing had found its way into the Christian church. For example, nearly all the people of the East, before the Christian era, were accustomed to worship with their faces directed towards the sun-rising. For they all believed that God, whom they supposed to resemble light, or rather to be light, and whom they included within certain bounds, had his residence in that part of the heavens where the sun rises. Those of them, indeed, who became Christians rejected this error, but the custom that originated from it, which was very ancient and universally prevalent, they retained. Nor even to this age has its abrogation been found practicable. For the same cause many Jewish rites originated, which are still religiously maintained by numbers of Christians, especially by those who live in eastern countries.²

§ 8. The rites themselves I shall state only summarily; for this extensive subject deserves to be considered by itself, and cannot be fully discussed in the narrow limits of our work. The Christians

Latins; yet he was not the first Roman initiated in them.—That *some mysteries* had before this time been introduced into the Roman worship, appears from the *Epistles* of Cicero to *Atticus*, l. v. 21, end; lib. vi. 1, end; l. xv. 25. Gronovius, indeed, understands these (*mysteria Romana*) to be the worship of the goddess Bona Dea. See his *Observ.* l. iv. c. 9. But on this worship, no male person might attend; and I see not why Cicero should inquire so particularly of his friend (as he does) about the time of these mysteries, if they were nothing but

the worship of a deity, in which none but females ever bore any part. *Schl.*]

¹ See Edm. Merill, *Observations*, lib. iii. cap. 3. [C. G. Schwartz, *Diss. de Ritibus quibusdam formulisque a manumissione ad S. Baptismum translatis*, Altdorf. 1738, and J. G. Zentgraf's *Diss.* at Jena, under Dr. Walch, 1749, *de Ritibus Baptismalibus sæculi secundi*. *Schl.*]

² See Jo. Spencer, *de Legibus ritualibus Ebræor.* Prolegom. p. 9, ed. Cantab. and all those who have explained the rites and usages of the oriental Christians.

assembled for the worship of God in *private dwelling-houses*, in *caves*, and in the places where the dead were buried. They met on the *first day* of the week; and in many places also on the *seventh day*, which was the Jewish sabbath. Most of them, likewise, held sacred the fourth and sixth, the former being the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, and the latter that on which he was crucified. The *hours* of the day allotted to these meetings varied according to times and circumstances; most of them could assemble only in the *evening* or *before the dawn* of day in the morning. When the Christians were assembled, *prayers* were recited (the purport of which *Tertullian* gives us¹); the *Holy Scriptures* were read;² short *discourses* on Christian duties were addressed to the people; *hymns* were sung; and at last, the *Lord's Supper* and the love-feasts were celebrated, the oblations of the people affording them the materials.³

§ 9. The Christians of this century consecrated anniversary festivals, in memory of the Saviour's death and resurrection, and of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles. The day in remembrance of *Christ's* dying and expiating the sins of men was called the *Passover*,⁴ because they supposed that *Christ* was crucified on the same day on which the Jews kept their *Passover*. But in observing this festival, the Christians of Asia Minor differed from other Christians, and especially from those of Rome.⁵ Both fasted during what was called the *great week*, that in which *Christ* died; and in remembrance of the last supper of our Saviour, they held a sacred feast or ate the paschal lamb, just as the Jews did; which feast, as well as the time of *Christ's* death, they denominated the *Passover*. Now the Asiatic Christians held their paschal feast on the fourteenth day, or full moon, of the first Jewish month, which was the very time on which the Jews ate their *Passover*; and on the third day after this supper, they kept the

¹ Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, cap. 39.

² [That other religious books, besides the canonical Scriptures, were read in several churches, appears from Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 23, and iii. 3, who informs us, that the first Epistle of Clement, and that of Soter, bishops of Rome, were publicly read in the church of Corinth; as was the *Shepherd* of Hermas, in very many churches. *Tr.*]

³ [Pliny (*Epistolar.* x. 97) gives some account of the public worship of the Christians, in the beginning of this century: and Justin Martyr, near the close of that *Apology* which he presented to Antoninus Pius, A.D. 150, gives a more full and authentic account (already extracted, Cent. i. pt. ii. ch. 4). Justin makes no mention here of *singing*, as a part of the public worship of Christians. But Pliny and his *Epistle* assures us: 'Quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire; *carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem.*' and both the New Testament, and all antiquity, recognise singing as a part of Christian worship. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Or Easter (*Pascha*). *Tr.*]

⁵ [There was, probably, a large proportion of converts from Judaism among them, and these men were anxious to engraft, as far as possible, the Mosaic ritual upon their new profession of Christianity. Within Palestine itself a different spirit prevailed, the church of Cæsarea, and even that of Jerusalem, conforming to the Roman usage in celebrating Easter; but the former of these churches consisted chiefly of converts from heathenism, and the latter had assumed very much of a Gentile character under Adrian. See Rose's *Neander*, p. 342. *S.*—Newman (*Arians*, c. i. § 1) distinguishes between the original Quartodecimans of *proconsular Asia*, who became extinct before 276 A.D.; those of Phrygia, of whose existence there is no evidence before the fourth century; and those of Syria, who adopted that rule under Paul of Samosata. In the two latter cases the custom seems to have been connected with Judaizing principles. *Ed.*]

memorial of *Christ's* triumph over death or of his resurrection. This custom they said they had received from the apostles *John* and *Philip*; and they moreover supported it by the example of *Christ* himself, who celebrated his paschal feast at the same time with the Jews. But the other Christians put off their *Passover*, that is, their paschal feast, until the evening preceding the festal day, sacred to *Christ's* resurrection,¹ and thus connected the memorial of *Christ's* death with that of his resurrection. And they cited *Peter* and *Paul* as authorities for their custom.

§ 10. The Asiatic custom of celebrating the *Passover* had two great inconveniences, which appeared intolerable to the other Christians, and especially to the Romans. First, by holding their sacred feast on the very day on which they supposed *Christ* ate the paschal lamb with his disciples, they interrupted the *fast* of the great week, which appeared to the other Christians to fall little short of a crime. Again, as they always kept the memorial of *Christ's* rising from the dead on the *third day* after their paschal supper, it unavoidably happened that they more commonly kept, on some other day of the week than the first or Sunday, called the Lord's-day, the festival of *Christ's* resurrection, which in after times was called, and is now called, the *Passover*, or *Easter*. Now the greater part of the Christians deemed it wrong to consecrate any other than the Lord's-day in remembrance of *Christ's* resurrection. Hence great contention frequently arose from this difference between the Asiatic and the other Christians. In the reign of *Antoninus Pius*, about the middle of this century, *Anicetus*, bishop of Rome, and *Polycarp*, bishop of Smyrna, discussed this question with great care at Rome.² But the Asiatics could not be induced by any considerations to give up their custom, which they believed to be handed down to them from *St. John*.³

§ 11. Near the close of the century, *Victor*, bishop of Rome, thought it necessary that the Asiatic Christians should be compelled, by laws and decrees, to follow the rule adopted by the greater part of the Christian world. Accordingly, after ascertaining the opinions of foreign bishops, he admonished the Asiatic bishops, in an imperious letter, to follow the example of other Christians in keeping *Easter*. They replied with spirit, by *Polyrates*, bishop of Ephesus, that they would not depart from the holy institution of their ancestors. Irritated by this decision, *Victor* excluded them from his communion, and from that of his church⁴ (not from that of the universal church,

¹ [Or Saturday evening. *Tr.*]

² [It does not appear that *Polycarp's* visit to Rome was for the particular purpose of debating the paschal question. That subject seems merely to have been discussed among others. But although *Anicetus* and *Polycarp* wholly failed of convincing each other, the difference was kindly borne on both sides, and the two prelates parted with mutual esteem. *Eusebius, H. E. v. 24, ed. Vales. i. 157. S.*]

³ *Eusebius, H. E. iv. 14, and v. 24.*

⁴ [*Victor* appears rather to have threatened this, and taken measures for effecting it, than actually to have done it. *Eusebius* says, ἀποτέμειν ὡς ἑτεροδοξούσας τῆς κοινῆς ἐνώσεως πειράται (*Hist. Eccl.* 156), *endeavours to cut them off from communion as heterodox*. He might have been restrained by the spirited remonstrances of those who agreed with him in opinion, but had greater temper and discretion. See the note of *Valesius* on this passage of *Eusebius, Annotat. i. 93. S.*]

which he had not power to do), that is, he pronounced them unworthy to be called his brethren. The progress of this disagreement was checked by Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, in letters wisely composed, directed to *Victor* and others, and by the Asiatic bishops, who wrote a long letter in their own justification. And thus both parties retained their respective customs, until the council of Nice, in the fourth century, abrogated the Asiatic usage.¹

§ 12. When the Christians celebrated the Lord's Supper, which they were accustomed to do chiefly on Sundays, they consecrated a part of the bread and wine of the oblations, by certain prayers, which the bishop of the congregation uttered. The wine was mixed with water; the bread was divided into small pieces. Portions of the consecrated bread and wine were commonly sent to the absent and the sick, in testimony of fraternal affection towards them.² There is much evidence that this most holy rite was regarded as necessary to the attainment of salvation; and I therefore dare not accuse of error those who believe that the sacred supper was, in this century, given to infants.³ Of the *love-feasts* the notice before given may be sufficient.

§ 13. Twice a year, namely, at *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*,⁴ baptism was publicly administered by the *bishop*, or by the *presbyters* acting by his command and authority. The candidates for it were immersed wholly in water, with invocation of the sacred Trinity, according to the Saviour's precept, after they had repeated what they called the *Creed*,⁵ and had renounced all their sins and transgressions, and especially the *devil* and his *pomp*. The baptized were signed with the cross, anointed, commended to God by prayer and imposition of hands, and finally directed to taste some milk and honey.⁶ The reasons for these rites must be sought in what has already been said respecting the causes of ceremonies in general. Adults were to prepare their minds, expressly, by prayers, fasting, and other devotional exercises. *Sponsors* or *godfathers* were, as I apprehend, first employed for adults, and afterwards for children likewise.⁷

¹ What is here stated briefly is more fully explained in my *Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 435, &c. I there said, p. 439, that Peter Faydit saw the mistake in the common accounts of this controversy. But my memory failed me. On consulting the book, I find that he treats of the controversy indeed, but he misunderstood the precise subject of it.—The venerable Heumann's tract on this controversy is republished in the *Sylloge* of his minor works.—[Mosheim thinks that many writers have mistaken the points at issue, from not distinguishing between the ancient and the more modern application of the term *Passover* or *Easter*. Tr.—So also Gieseler, i. 178. Ed.]

² See Henry Rixner, *de Ritibus veterum Christianorum, circa Eucharistiam*, p. 155, &c.

³ See Jo. Fr. Mayer, *de Eucharistia Infantum*; and Peter Zornius, *Historia Eucharistiae Infantum*, Berol. 1736, 8vo.

⁴ *Festis Paschatis et Pentecostes dictus*. See W. Wall, *History of Infant Baptism*, i. 277, 279, of the Latin edition by Schlosser; Jos. Vicecomes, *de Ritibus Baptismi*, Paris, 1618, 8vo.

⁵ *Symbolum, quod vocabant*.

⁶ See especially Tertullian *de Baptismo* [and respecting the honey and milk, Tertullian, *de Corona*; and Clemens Alex. *Pædag.* l. i. c. 6. *Schl.*]

⁷ See Ger. van Mastricht, *de Susceptoribus Infantum ex Baptismo*, edit. 2nd, Frankf. 1727, 4to. He thinks sponsors were used for children, and not for adults; p. 15. See also W. Wall, *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, i. 69, 474, &c. [The manner of receiving new converts into the churches, about the year 150, is thus minutely described by Justin Martyr, in his (so called) second *Apology*, towards the conclusion: 'In what manner we dedicate ourselves

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SEPARATIONS OR HERESIES.

§ 1. Discord among the Jewish Christians — § 2. Hence the Nazarenes and Ebionites — § 3. Their impiety — § 4. The sects originating from the oriental philosophy — § 5. Elxai and Elcesaites — § 6. Saturninus; his extravagances — § 7. Cerdo and Marcion — § 8. Bardesanes — § 9. Tatian and the Encratites — § 10. Peculiar sentiments of the Egyptian Gnostics — § 11. Basilides — § 12. His enormities — § 13. His moral principles — § 14. Carpocrates — § 15. Valentinus — § 16. His extravagances — § 17. Various sects of Valentinians — § 18. The minor sects of Valentinians — § 19. The Ophites — § 20. Monarchians and Patripassians — § 21. Theodotus, Artemon — § 22. Hermogenes — § 23. The illiterate sects. Montanus — § 24. The success of Montanus and his doctrine.

§ 1. AMONG the Christian sects that arose in this century, the first place is due to those Jewish Christians, whose zeal for the Mosaic law severed them from the other believers in *Christ*.¹ The rise of this

to God, after being renewed by Christ, we will now explain: lest, by omitting this, we should seem to dissemble in our statement. Those who believe and are persuaded that the things we teach and inculcate are true, and who profess ability thus to live, are directed to pray, with fasting, and to ask of God the forgiveness of their former sins; we also fasting and praying with them. Then we conduct them to a place where there is water; and they are regenerated [baptized], in the manner in which we have been regenerated [baptized]; for they receive a washing with water, in the name of the Father of all, the Lord God, and of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ said, *Except ye be regenerated, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.* — ‘This washing is likewise called *illumination*; because the minds of those who have learned these things are enlightened. And whoever is enlightened is washed in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate; and in the name of the Holy Spirit, who, by the prophets, foretold all that relates to Christ.’ — ‘And after thus washing the convinced and consenting person, we conduct him to where the brethren, as we call them, are assembled; and there offer our united supplications, with earnestness, both for ourselves and for the enlightened person, and for all others everywhere: that we may conduct ourselves as becomes those who have received the truth, and by our deeds

prove ourselves good citizens, and observers of what is commanded us: so that we may be saved with an eternal salvation. And on ending our prayers, we salute each other with a kiss. Then there is placed before the President of the brethren, bread, and a cup of water and wine; which he taking, offers praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks at great length, that such blessings are vouchsafed us; and when he ends the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present respond, *Amen*. Now the word *amen*, in the Hebrew tongue, signifies *so be it*. And after the President has given thanks, and all the people have uttered the response, those whom we call Deacons distribute to everyone present, to partake of, the bread and the wine and water, over which thanks were given: and to those not present, the Deacons carry it. And this food is called by us the *Eucharist*; which it is unlawful for anyone to partake of, unless he believes the things taught by us to be true, and has been washed with the washing for the remission of sins in regeneration, and lives according to what Christ has taught.’ *Tr.*]

¹ [‘This heresy is scarcely noticed by Tertullian.’ (Bp. Kaye’s *Tertullian*, 470.) For fuller information respecting sects of this class, Rose’s *Neander*, ii. 4, may be advantageously consulted. S.]

sect took place in the reign of *Adrian*. For, when this emperor had wholly destroyed Jerusalem a second time, and enacted severe laws against the Jews, the greater part of the Christians living in Palestine, that they might not be confounded with Jews, as they had been, laid aside the Mosaic ceremonies, and chose one *Mark*, who was a foreigner and not a Jew, for their bishop. This procedure was very offensive to those among them whose attachment to the Mosaic rites was too strong to be eradicated. They therefore separated from their brethren, and formed a distinct society in *Peræa*, a part of Palestine, and in the neighbouring regions; and among them the Mosaic law retained all its dignity unimpaired.¹

§ 2. This body of people, who would unite *Moses* and *Christ*, was again divided into two classes, differing widely in their opinions and customs, the *Nazarenes* and the *Ebionites*. The former are not reckoned by the ancient Christians among heretics,² but the latter are placed among those sects which subverted the foundations of religion. Both sects used a history of *Christ* or a *Gospel*, which was different from our *Gospels*.³ The word *Nazarene* was not the name of a *sect*, but was equivalent to the word *Christian*. For those who bore the title of *Christians* among the Greeks were by the Jews called *Nazarenes*, which was far from disagreeable to them. Those who retained, after separating from their brethren, this first name for our Lord's disciples, being the very one imposed on them by the Jews, believed *Christ* to be born of a virgin, and to be in some way united with the divine nature.⁴ And although they would never

¹ See Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, ii. 31, p. 245, &c. [p. 381, ed. Hornii, 1647. He says, 'Adrian stationed a regiment of soldiers as a constant guard to prevent all Jews from entering Jerusalem; which was advantageous to the Christian faith; because, at that time, nearly all [the Jewish Christians] believed in Christ as God, yet with an observance of the law.' Tr.]

² The first that ranked the Nazarenes among the heretics was Epiphanius, a writer of the fourth century, of no great fidelity, or accuracy of judgment. [A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 619, 620, thinks the Nazarenes, described by Epiphanius, were descendants of the Ebionites, who had now imbibed some Gnostic principles. The names Ebionites and Nazarenes are often confounded, both by ancients and moderns. Tr.]

³ See J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryph.* N. T. i. 355, &c., and Mosheim, *Vindiciæ, contra Tolandî Nazarenum*, p. 112, &c. [Jones on the *Canon of the New Test.* vol. i. and the authors of Introductions to the New Test. Tr.]

⁴ [On the Nazarenes, see Mosheim, *Institutt. Hist. Chr. major.* p. 465, de *Rebus Chr. Gc.* p. 328; C. W. F. Walch, *Entw. d. Gesch. d. Ketzereyen*, i. 101. Burton, *Eocl.*

Hist. 263. Tr. & S. — According to Mosheim, the title first belonged to the Jewish converts, taken by them in reference to Matt. ii. 23; while the Gentiles at Antioch assumed the Greek name of *Christians*. As the Jewish converts generally threw off the Mosaic ordinances, it became the peculiar designation of the church of Jerusalem; and when that church threw off its Jewish exterior in the reign of Adrian, it finally settled with a scanty remnant who clung to the law as essential. (Newman's *Arians*, c. i. § 1, note.) According to Epiphanius, who is the first writer who calls them heretics, they as well as the Ebionites were the descendants of the Christians who seceded to Pella in Decapolis about 66, and there they existed at the end of the fourth century. (Burton, *Eocl. Hist.* 261.) Whether they were heretics or not is a question. Newman thinks that their Judaizing ended in something like modern Socinianism; Burton, that at first there was no other peculiarity in their tenets, than that they adhered to the law of Moses; Hey (*Lectures*, i. 266), that they seem not to have allowed the pre-existence of Christ. Robertson, with Gieseler and others, counts them orthodox, and contrasts them with the undoubtedly

discard the ceremonies prescribed by *Moses*, yet they did not obtrude them upon the Gentile Christians. They rejected, moreover, the additions made to the Mosaic ritual by the doctors of the law and the Pharisees.¹ It is therefore easy to see why the other Christians in general judged more favourably of them.

§ 3. Whether the *Ebionites* derived their name from a man, or were so denominated on account of their *poverty*, either in regard to property or sentiment, is uncertain.² But they were much worse than the Nazarenes. For though they supposed *Christ* to be an ambassador of God, and endowed with divine power, yet they conceived him to be a man, born, in the ordinary course of nature, from *Joseph* and *Mary*. They maintained that the ceremonial law of *Moses* must be observed, not by the Jews only, but also by all who wished to obtain salvation; and, therefore, *St. Paul*, as the most strenuous opposer of the law, they viewed with abhorrence. Nor were they satisfied with the mere rites which *Moses* appointed, but also observed, with equal veneration, the superstitious rites of their

heretical Ebionites. It is possible that all that is reported of them by the ancients may be reconciled as being true of them at different epochs; that the Judaizing tendency which, earlier, was but a national peculiarity, had ripened by the time of Epiphanius into heresy. *Ed.*]

¹ See Mich. le Quien, *Adnotatt. ad Damascenum*, i. 82, 83, and his *Diss. de Nazarenis et eorum fide*; which is the seventh of his Dissertations subjoined to his edition of the *Works of Damascenus*. [Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 101, &c. *Schl.*]

² See Fabricius, *ad Philastr. de hæresibus*, p. 81. Thom. Ittig, *de Hæresibus Ævi Apostolici*, [and A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 612, &c. *Tr.*—The origin of the name is still a subject of controversy. Some derive it from a founder, Ebion, others from the Hebrew עֲבִיּוֹנִים, *poor people*, but are not agreed why this name was given to the sect. Others again regard the whole subject as an historical problem that can never be solved with absolute certainty. See Walch, *Entw. d. Gesch. d. Ketz.* i. 110; Mosheim, *Instit. H. Ch. major*, 447, and his *Diss. qua ostenditur, certo hodie et explorato constitui non posse, utrum Ebion quidam novæ sectæ auctor extiterit olim inter Christianos necne?* in his *Dissertt. ad Hist. Eccl. pertinent.* i. 547. See also Chr. Alb. Doederlein, *Commentar. de Ebionæ e numero hostium Christi eximendis*, Büzow, 1770, 8vo. *Schl.*—‘It is impossible not to connect the Ebionites in many respects with the Jews; but, at the same time, they held opinions from which an orthodox Jew would have started with horror. It is sufficient to mention, that they treated the writings of the prophets

with contempt, and denied their inspiration. So also, while we find that the name of Jesus held a conspicuous place in their creed, we find them also believing him to be born of human parents, and maintaining that Christ was an emanation from God, which descended upon Jesus at his baptism. All these peculiarities are explained, when it is stated that the Ebionites were a branch of the Gnostics.’ Burton’s *Eccl. Hist.* 264. *S.*—According to Gieseler, the name of Ebionites was first given by the Jews to the Christians, generally in derision: after the schism in the church of Jerusalem on the death of Symeon, it was given to the party that made our Lord the son of Joseph and Mary, and then became the general appellation of heretical Jewish Christians. Gieseler, i. 99—101. *Ed.*—‘They are more than once mentioned by Tertullian, who always speaks of them as having received their appellation from their founder, Ebion.’ (Kaye’s *Tertullian*, 471.) ‘Tertullian is the first who makes mention of a founder, named Ebion, and others have followed him in this account. Better informed writers, such as Irenæus and Origen, know of no such person; and it is clear that the invention of such a person arose from the not understanding the name of Ebionite. Origen gives us the proper derivation of the term, namely, from the Hebrew, *Ebion*, *poor*.’ (Rose’s *Neander*, ii. 10.) The Ebionites made a strict profession of poverty, esteeming the world and all its allurements as the property of Satan, and themselves, accordingly, obliged to relinquish everything earthly beyond the barest requirements of nature. *S.*]

ancestors, and the customs of the Pharisees, which were added to the law.¹

§ 4. These little and obscure sects were not very detrimental to the Christian cause. Much greater disturbance was produced by those whose founders explained the doctrines of Christianity agreeably to the precepts of oriental philosophy respecting the origin of evil.² These latter sects, having lived in obscurity, and made little noise previously to this century, came forth into public view during the reign of *Adrian*,³ and gathered churches of considerable magnitude in various countries. A long catalogue of these semi-Christian bodies might be extracted from ancient monuments: but of the greater part of them we know no more than their names; and perhaps many of them differed only in name from each other. Those which acquired notoriety beyond others may be divided into two classes. The first class originated in Asia, and maintained the philosophy of the East in regard to the origin of the universe (if I may so say), pure and entire: the other class, which was formed in Egypt and by Egyptians, mingled with that philosophy many of their country's prodigies and precepts. The systems of the former were more simple and intelligible; those of the latter were much more complicated, and more difficult of explication.

§ 5. The first place in the Asiatic class seems to belong to *Elxai*, a Jew, who is said to have founded the sect of the *Elcesaites*, in the reign of *Trajan*.⁴ Though he was a Jew, and worshipped one God, and revered *Moses*, yet he corrupted the religion of his fathers by many false notions derived from the philosophy and superstition of the orientals; and, after the example of the *Essenes*, expounded the Mosaic law according to the dictates of reason, or, in other words, made it an allegory. But *Epiphanius*, who had read one of *Elxai's*

¹ Irenæus, *contra Hereses*, i. 26. Epiphanius treats largely of the Ebionites in his *Hæres.* xxx. But he is worthy of no credit; for he acknowledges (§ 3, p. 127, and § 14, p. 141) that he has joined the Sampseans and the Elcesaites with the Ebionites, and that the first Ebionites did not hold the errors which he attributes to the sect.—[The correctness of Epiphanius, as an historian, is often called in question; and perhaps justly. But if the term Ebionites designated a variety of minor sects, all of them Jewish Christians, and if some of these sects had, in the fourth century, imbibed Gnostic sentiments, unknown to the original Ebionites, then Epiphanius may here be entirely correct, which others suppose to be the fact. See Neander, as cited above, Note 2, p. 139. *Tr.*]

² [Neither he (Tertullian) nor any other of the early Fathers, appears to have thought that the heretics derived their notions from the oriental philosophy. On the contrary, Tertullian repeatedly charges them with borrowing from Pythagoras, and

Plato, and other Greek philosophers. In like manner, Irenæus affirms that Valentinus was indebted for his succession of Æons to the Theogonies of the Greek poets.' Kaye's *Tertullian*, 472. *S.*]

³ Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* l. vii. c. 17, p. 898. Cyprian, *Epist.* lxxv. p. 144, and others.

⁴ [‘Elxai appears to have been entirely unknown to Tertullian.’ Kaye's *Tertullian*, 473. *S.*—The name of Elcesaites is variously derived from the town Elcesi in Galilee, from Elxai, the founder, or from Hebrew words signifying *secret power*. They were found about the Dead Sea, and their tenets are the basis of the *Clementines*. (Gieseler, i. 101.) According to Hippolytus, this heresy was brought to Rome in the time of Callistus, 218—223, by Alcibiades of Apamea, who produced a book which Elchasai, a just man, had received from the Seres of Parthia in the time of Trajan, delivered by an angel. Wordsworth (*Hippolytus*, p. 270—272) compares them with the Mormonites. *Ed.*]

books, acknowledges himself in doubt, whether the *Elcesaites* should be reckoned among the Christian sects, or among the Jewish. In his book *Elxai* mentions *Christ*, and speaks honourably of him; but he does not explain himself so as to make it manifest whether *Jesus of Nazareth* was the Christ of whom he speaks.¹

§ 6. If no account be taken of *Elxai*, *Saturninus* of Antioch will justly stand at the head of this class: at least he lived earlier than all the other *Gnostic* heresiarchs.² He supposed *two first causes* of all things, the *good God*, and *matter*, which is in its nature evil, and subject to a Lord. The world and the first men were created by seven angels, that is, by the rulers of the seven planets, without the knowledge of God, and against the will of the Lord of matter. But God approved of the work when it was completed, imparted rational souls to the men who before had only animal life, and divided the entire world into seven parts, which he subjected to the seven creators, of whom the God of the Jews was one, reserving, however, the supreme power to himself. To the good beings formed, the men, that is, possessed of wise and good souls, the Lord of matter opposed another sort of men, to whom he imparted a malignant soul. And hence the difference between good and bad men, which is so visible. After the creators of the world had revolted from the supreme God, he sent down *Christ* from heaven to our globe, clothed not with a real body, but with the shadow of one, that he might destroy the kingdom of the Lord of matter, and show good souls the way of returning back to God. But this way is difficult and harsh. For souls that would mount up to God, when the frame dissolves, must be prepared by abstinence from flesh, wine, marriage, and every other thing which either invigorates the body or delights the senses. *Saturninus* taught in Syria, which was his native country, and especially at Antioch; and he drew many after him, by a great show of virtue.³

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 38. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xix. § 3, p. 41. Theodoret, *Fabul. Hæret.* ii. 7, p. 221. [Hippolytus, *adv. Hæres.* p. 292 and 330. Wordsworth's *Hipp.* 271 and 316. Burton's *Eccles. Hist.* 304, 524. Gieseler, i. 100, 206. *Ed.*—Of these *Elcesaites*, who were also called *Sampsæans*, everything afforded by antiquity, that is important, has been collected by Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 587, &c. He justly accounts them enthusiasts. *Schl.*]

² [Having taught his doctrine in the reign of Adrian. *Tr.*]

³ Irenæus, i. 24. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 7. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xxxiii. Theodoret, *Fabul. Hæret.* i. 2. And the other writers on the heresies. [Among the modern writers, see Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 336, &c. Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 274, &c. Ittig, *de Hæresiarch. sæcul. secundi*, c. 1. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, ii. 215. *Tr.*—‘The seven star-spirits,’ as Neander calls the creating angels, ‘being stationed between the realms of light and those of darkness, united in a design, according to Saturninus, to win from

the regions of darkness a land in which they could establish an independent kingdom. Thus arose the earth; but when it was created, its architects had the mortification of seeing that no more than a faint gleam of light from the celestial regions shone upon it here and there. To secure more of this, they formed a being cast in the image of that luminous form which played before them. Their workmanship, however, could not even stand upright, until the Supreme God, compassionating its helpless condition, breathed into it a spark of his own divine nature. Thus originated man as he really is, a being not only created after the most exalted model, but also kindly endued from above with a power of looking upwards in life, and of mounting thither after death.’ Rose’s *Neander*, ii. 107. ‘Of Saturninus, the name occurs but once in our author’s (Tertullian’s) writings. He is there described as a disciple of Menander, who was himself a disciple of Simon Magus.’ Kaye’s *Tertullian*, 474. *S.*]

§ 7. In the same class of Asiatic Gnostics, must be placed *Cerdo*, a Syrian,¹ and *Marcion*, the son of a bishop of Pontus.² The history of these men is obscure and uncertain. It appears, however, that they began to establish their sect at Rome; that *Cerdo* taught his principles there before *Marcion's* arrival; that *Marcion*, failing to obtain some office in the Roman church from his own misconduct, joined *Cerdo's* party, and then with great success propagated his tenets over the world. In the manner of the orientals *Marcion* taught that there are two *first causes* of all things, the one perfectly *good*, the other perfectly *evil*. Between these two deities, is interposed the Architect of this lower world, which men inhabit, and who is the God and lawgiver of the Jews. His nature is neither perfectly good nor perfectly evil, but mixed, or, as *Marcion* expressed it, he is *just*; and therefore can dispense punishments as well as rewards. The author of evil and the Creator of the world are perpetually at war. Each wishes to be worshipped as God, and to subject the inhabitants of the whole globe to himself. The Jews are the subjects of the Creator of the world, who is a very powerful spirit; the other nations, which worship many gods, are under the author of evil. Each is an oppressor of rational souls, and holds them in bondage. In order, therefore, to end this war, and give freedom to the souls which are of divine origin, the supreme God sent among the Jews *Jesus Christ*, who is of a nature very similar to himself, or his Son, clothed with the appearance or shadow of a body, to render him visible, with commission to destroy both the kingdom of the world's Creator, and that of the evil principle, and to bring souls back to God. He was assailed both by the prince of darkness, and by the God of the Jews, or the world's Creator; but they were unable to hurt him, because he had only the appearance of a body. Whoever shall, as *he* prescribed, withdraw their minds from sensible objects, and, renouncing as well the laws of the God of the Jews as those of the prince of darkness, shall turn wholly to the supreme God, at the same time subduing and mortifying their bodies by fasting and other means, shall, after death, ascend to the celestial mansions. The moral discipline which *Marcion* prescribed to his followers was, as the nature of the system required, very austere and rigorous. For he condemned marriages, wine, flesh, and whatever is grateful and pleasant to the body. *Marcion* had numerous followers; among whom *Lucan*, or *Lucian*, *Severus*, *Blastes*, and others, but especially *Apelles*,³ are said to have

¹ ['Of Cerdo, Tertullian only states that Marcion borrowed many notions from him.' Kaye's *Tertullian*, 474. S.]

² ['From various notices scattered over Tertullian's writings, we may collect that Marcion was a native of Pontus, that he flourished during the reign of Antoninus Pius and the pontificate of Eleutherus, being originally in communion with the church at Rome; that he was a man fond of novelties, by the publication of which he unsettled the faith of the weaker brethren,

and was in consequence more than once ejected from the congregation; that he afterwards became sensible of his errors, and expressed a wish to be reconciled to the church; and that his wish was granted, on condition that he should bring back with him those whom he had perverted by his doctrines. He died, however, before he was formally restored to its communion.' Kaye's *Tertullian*, 475. S.]

³ ['Lucan is once mentioned by Tertullian as holding the opinion, that neither

deviated in some respects from the opinions of their master, and to have established new sects.¹

§ 8. *Bardesanes* and *Tatian* are commonly supposed to have been of the school of *Valentinus* the Egyptian, but erroneously; for their systems differ in many respects from that of the Valentinians, and come nearer to the oriental principle of two first causes of all things. *Bardesanes* was a Syrian of Edessa, a man of great acumen, and distinguished for his many learned productions. Seduced by love of the oriental philosophy, he placed, in opposition to the supreme God, who is absolute goodness, a prince of darkness, who is the author of all evil. The supreme God created the world free from all evil, and formed men with celestial souls, and subtle ethereal bodies. When, however, the prince of darkness had induced the first men to sin, God permitted the author of all evil to enclose them in gross bodies formed out of sinful matter, and also to corrupt the world, in order that men might suffer for their iniquity. Hence the struggle between reason and concupiscence in man. *Jesus*, therefore, descended from the celestial regions, clothed, not with a real, but with a celestial and ethereal body, and taught men to subdue their depraved bodies, and to free themselves from the bondage of vicious matter, by abstinence, by meditation, and by fasting; and whoever will do so, on the dissolution of the body, shall ascend to the mansions of the blessed, clothed in the ethereal vehicles, or celestial bodies, which properly belong to them. *Bardesanes* afterwards returned to sounder sentiments; but his sect long survived in Syria.²

§ 9. *Tatian*, by birth an Assyrian, a distinguished and learned man, and disciple of *Justin Martyr*, was more noted among the ancients for his austere moral principles, which were rigid beyond measure, than for the speculative errors or dogmas which he proposed as articles of faith to his followers.³ Yet it appears from credible witnesses, that he held *matter* to be the source of all evil, and

the soul nor the body would rise again, but a sort of third substance.' Kaye's *Tertullian*, 505. Apelles is frequently mentioned by Tertullian, who taxes him with immorality; but Rhodon, who lived at the beginning of the third century, and who was hostile to him, says that his good conduct earned him general respect. He differed from his master as to Christ's human body, which he considered to have been real, though not born of the Virgin Mary, but brought down from the stars. It was, therefore, flesh, although not the ordinary flesh of men. Rose's *Neander*, ii. 135. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 507. S.]

¹ Besides the common writers on the heresies, as Irenæus, Epiphanius, Theodoret, &c., see Tertullian's five *Books against Marcion*; and the *Poem against Marcion*, also in five books, which is ascribed to Tertullian; and the *Dialogue against the Marcionites*, which is ascribed to Origen.

Among the modern writers, see Massuet, the editor of Irenæus, Tillemont, Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, ii. 69, &c.—[Walch, *Histoire der Ketzerereyen*, i. 484—537. Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 401—410. A. Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. pt. ii. p. 779—807. Tr.]

² Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 30, and the writers on the ancient heresies. Origen, *Dial. contra Marcionitas*, § 3, p. 70, ed. Wetstein. Fred. Strunzius, *Historia Bardesanis et Bardesanistar.* Wittemb. 1722, 4to. Beausobre, *Hist. du Manichéisme*, ii. 128, &c. [Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 394, &c. Walch, *Histoire der Ketzerereyen*, i. 407—424. A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. pt. ii. p. 743, &c. Tr.]

³ [Tatian, after the death of Justin Martyr, was said to have borrowed some errors from the Gnostics, others from the Valentinians, others again from the Marcionists., *Cent. Magdebb.* ii. 100. S.]

therefore recommended the abhorrence and the mortification of the body; that he supposed the Creator of the world and the true God to be not one and the same being; that he denied to our Saviour a real body; and corrupted Christianity with other doctrines of the oriental philosophers. His followers, who were numerous, were sometimes called from him, *Tatiani*, or *Tatianists*; but more frequently were designated by names indicative of their austere morals. For, as they discarded all the external comforts and conveniences of life, and held wine in such abhorrence as to use mere water in the Lord's Supper, fasted rigorously, and lived in celibacy, they were denominated *Encratitæ*,¹ or *abstainers*, *Hydroparastatæ*,² or *Water-drinkers*, and *Apotactitæ*, or *Renouncers*.³

§ 10. The Gnostics of the Egyptian class differed from those of the Asiatic, in combining the oriental with Egyptian philosophy, and more especially in the following particulars:—1. Although they supposed matter to be eternal, and also animated, yet they did not recognise an eternal prince of darkness and of matter, or the evil principle of the Persians. 2. They generally considered *Christ* our Saviour as consisting of *two persons*, the man *Jesus*, and the Son of God, or *Christ*; and the latter, the divine person, they supposed to have entered into *Jesus* the man, when he was baptized in Jordan by *John*; and to have left him when he was made a prisoner by the Jews. 3. They attributed to *Christ* a real and not an imaginary body, though they were not all of one sentiment on this point. 4. They prescribed to their followers a much milder system of moral discipline; nay, seemed to give precepts which favoured the corrupt propensities of men.

§ 11. Among the Egyptian Gnostics, the first place is commonly assigned to *Basilides* of Alexandria. He maintained that the supreme and all-perfect God produced from himself seven most excellent beings, or *Æons*. Two of the *Æons*, namely, *Dynamis* and *Sophia* (*Power* and *Wisdom*), procreated the angels of the highest order. Those angels built for themselves a residence, or heaven, and produced other angels of a nature little inferior. Other generations of angels succeeded, and other heavens were built, until there were three hundred and sixty-five heavens, and as many orders of angels; that is, just as many as there are days in a year. Over all these heavens and angelic orders, there is a Prince or Lord, whom *Basilides* called *Abraxas*; a word doubtless in use among the Egyptians before his time, and which, when written in Greek, contains letters that together

¹ [They abstained both from wine and animal food. *Cent. Magdebb.* ii. 102. Cf. *Kaye's Tertullian*, 260. *S.*]

² [Because they used water instead of wine at the Communion. *Cent. Magdebb.* ii. 102. *S.*]

³ The only work of Tatian that has reached us, is his *Oratio ad Græcos*. His opinions are spoken of by Clemens Alex. *Strom.* l. iii. p. 460, Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xlv. c. 1, p. 391, Origen, *de Oratione*, c. 13,

p. 77, ed. Oxon. and by others of the ancients; but no one of them has attempted to delineate his system. [Of the moderns, see Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, i. 445—447, and A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. pt. ii. p. 762—766. It should be remembered, that the names *Encratites*, *Apotactites* (*Ἐγκρατῖται*, *Ἀποτακτοί*) were applied to all the austere sects; so that though all *Tatianists* were *Encratites*, yet all *Encratites* were not *Tatianists*. *Tr.*]

make up the number of 365; that is, the number of the heavens.¹ The inhabitants of the lowest heaven, contiguous to eternal matter, which is an animated and malignant substance, formed a design of constructing a world out of that disorderly mass, and of fabricating men. God approved the work when it was finished, and gave rational souls to these men whom the angels had formed; whereas, before they had only sensitive souls: he also gave to the angels themselves dominion over men. The prince of these angels chose the Jewish nation for *his* subjects, and gave them a law by *Moses*. The other angels presided over other nations.

§ 12. The angels who created and governed the world gradually became corrupt; and not only laboured to obliterate the knowledge of the supreme God, in order that they might themselves be worshipped as gods, but also waged war with each other for the enlargement of their respective territories. The most arrogant and restless of them all was he who governed the Jewish nation. Therefore, the supreme God, in compassion to the souls endowed with reason, sent down from heaven his Son, or the prince of the *Æons*, whose name is *Nus* [*voûs, mind*], and *Christ*; that he, joining himself to the man *Jesus*, might restore the lost knowledge of his Father, and overturn the empire of the angels who governed the world, and especially of the insolent Lord of the Jews. The God of the Jews perceiving this, ordered his subjects to seize the man Jesus, and put him to death: but against *Christ* he had no power.² The souls that obey the precepts of the Son of God, when their bodies die, will ascend to God; the rest will pass into other bodies. All bodies return back to vicious matter, whence they originated.

§ 13. The moral system of *Basilides*, if we believe most of the ancients, favoured concupiscence, and allowed every species of iniquity.

¹ A great number of gems still exist, and quantities of them are daily brought to us from Egypt, on which, besides other figures of Egyptian device, the word *Abraxas* is engraved. See Jo. Macarius, *Abraxas seu de Gemmis Basilidianis disquisitionis*; enlarged by Jo. Chiflet, ed. Antwerp, 1657, 4to. Bern. de Montfaucon, *Palæograph. Græca*, ii. 8, p. 177, &c. and others. Learned men almost universally think those gems originated from Basilides; and hence they are called *gemmæ Basilidianæ*. But very many of them exhibit marks of the most degrading superstition, such as cannot be attributed even to a semi-Christian; and likewise manifest insignia of the Egyptian religion. They cannot *all* therefore be attributed to Basilides, who, though he held many errors, yet worshipped Christ. Those only must refer to him which bear some marks of Christianity. The word *Abraxas* was unquestionably used by the ancient Egyptians, and appropriated to the Lord of the heavens; which Basilides retained from the philosophy and religion of his country. See Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire du Mani-*

chisme, ii. 51. Jo. Bapt. Passeri, *Diss. de Gemmis Basilidianis*; in his splendid work, *de Gemmis Stelliferis*, ii. 221, &c. ed. Florent. 1750, fol. P. E. Jablonski, *de Nominis Abraxas Significatione*; in the *Miscellan. Lipsiens. Nova*, t. vii. Passeri contends that *none* of these gems have reference to Basilides: he makes them all refer to the magicians, or the soothsayers, sorcerers, conjurors, and fortune-tellers. But this learned man, it appears to me, goes too far; for he himself acknowledges (p. 225), that *he sometimes found on them some vestiges of the Basilidian errors*. These celebrated gems still need an erudite, but cautious and judicious interpreter.

² Many of the ancients tell us, on the authority of Irenæus, that our Saviour, according to Basilides' opinion, had not a real body; and that Simon the Cyrenian was crucified in place of him. But that Basilides supposed the man Jesus and Christ, united, to constitute the Saviour, is demonstrated in the *Comt. de Reb. Chr. &c.* p. 354, &c. It may be, that here and there a follower of Basilides held otherwise.

But from much surer testimony it appears that he recommended purity of life and the practice of piety, and condemned even an inclination to sin. Still there were some things in his moral precepts which greatly offended other Christians. For he taught that it is lawful to conceal our religion, to deny *Christ* when our life is in danger, to participate in the pagan feasts which followed their sacrifices; and he detracted much from the estimation and honour in which the martyrs were held, maintaining, that, being greater sinners than other men, they were visited by divine justice for their iniquities. For it was a principle with him, that none but sinners suffer any evil in this life. And hence arose the suspicions entertained respecting his system of morals, which seemed to be confirmed by the flagitious lives of some of his disciples.¹

§ 14. But much viler than he, and the worst of all the Gnostics, was *Carpocrates*, also of Alexandria.² His philosophy did not differ in its general principles from that of the other Egyptian Gnostics. For he admitted one supreme God, *Æons*, the offspring of God, eternal and malignant matter, the creation of the world from evil matter by angels, divine souls unfortunately enclosed in bodies, and the like. But he maintained that *Jesus* was born of *Joseph* and *Mary* in the ordinary course of nature, and that he was superior to other men in nothing but fortitude and greatness of soul. He also not only gave his disciples licence to sin, but imposed on them, besides, a necessity of sinning, by teaching that the way to eternal salvation was open to those souls only which had committed all kinds of enormity and wickedness. It is, however, utterly beyond credibility, that any man who believes that there is a God, that *Christ* is the Saviour of mankind, and who inculcates any sort of religion, should hold such sentiments. Besides, there are grounds to believe, that *Carpocrates*, like the other Gnostics, held the Saviour to be composed of the man *Jesus*, and a certain *Æon* called *Christ*; and that he imposed some laws of conduct on his disciples. Yet, undoubtedly, there was something in his opinions and precepts that rendered his piety very suspicious. For he held that concupiscence was implanted in the soul by the Deity, and is therefore perfectly innocent; that all actions are in themselves indifferent, and become good or evil only according to the opinions and laws of men; that in the purpose of God all things are common property, even the women, but that such as use their rights, are by human laws accounted thieves and adulterers. Now if he did not add some corrective to the enormity of these principles, it must be acknowledged that he wholly swept away the foundations of all virtue, and gave full licence to all iniquity.³

¹ Besides the ancient writers on the heresies, Basilides is particularly treated of by Ren. Massuet, *Dissert. in Irenæum*; and Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, ii. 8, &c. [Walch, *Historie der Ketzerereyen*, i. 281—309; Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 342—361; and A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. pt. ii. p. 679—704. *Tr.*]

² [Who lived in the reign of Adrian. *Tr.*]

³ See Irenæus, *contra Hæres.* i. 25. Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* iii. p. 511, and the others. [Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 361—371. Walch, *Historie der Ketzer.* i. 309—327. A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 767—773. *Carpocrates* left a

§ 15. *Valentinus*, also an Egyptian, exceeded all his fellow heresiarchs, both in fame and in the multitude of his followers.¹ His sect had its birth at Rome, grew to maturity in the island of Cyprus, and with wonderful celerity traversed Asia, Africa, and Europe. *Valentinus* held the general principles common with his brother Gnostics, and assumed the title of a *Gnostic*; yet he held several principles peculiar to himself. In the *Pleroma* (which is the Gnostic name for the habitation of God), he supposed thirty Æons, fifteen males and as many females. Besides these there were four unmarried; namely, *Horus* [*"Opos*], the guardian of the confines of the *Pleroma*,² *Christ*, the *Holy Spirit*, and *Jesus*. The youngest of the Æons, *Sophia* (*Wisdom*), fired with vast desire of comprehending the nature of the supreme Deity, in her agitation brought forth a daughter called *Achamoth*; ³ who, being excluded from the *Pleroma*, descended to the rude and shapeless mass of matter, reduced it to some degree of order, and by the aid of *Jesus* brought forth the *Demiurge*,⁴ the king and artificer of all things. This *Demiurge* separated the more subtle, or *animal* matter, from the grosser, or *material*; and out of the former he framed the world above us, or the visible heavens; out of the latter, the lower world, or this earth. Men he compounded of both kinds of matter; and his mother, *Achamoth*, added to them a third substance, which was celestial and spiritual. This is a brief outline of the complicated and tedious fable of *Valentinus*. It appears that he explained the origin of the world, and of the human race, in a more subtle manner than the other Gnostics; yet that he did not differ from them in reality. And the same is true of the other parts of his system.

§ 16. The Architect of the world gradually became so inflated, that he either thought himself, or at least wished men to think him, to be the only God; and by his prophets, sent among the Jews, he arrogated to himself the honours of the supreme God. And the other angels, who presided over parts of the created universe, imitated his example. To repress this insolence of the *Demiurge*, and imbue souls with the knowledge of the true God, *Christ* descended, being composed of an animal and spiritual substance, and moreover, clothed with an ethereal body. He passed through the body of *Mary*, just as water through a canal; and to him *Jesus*, one of the highest Æons, joined

young son Epiphanes, to propagate his system: and this son, though he died at the age of 17, wrote a book, from which the world have had to learn what they could of the tenets of Carpocrates. It is doubtful whether he ought to be called a Christian. He was an Egyptian philosopher, who had perhaps borrowed some notions from the Christians, but still his philosophy was his cynosure. *Tr.*—Two inscriptions, regarded as Carpocratian, and pretended to have been found at Cyrene, are now shown to be forgeries. Gieseler, i. 143. *Ed.*

¹ [If we may judge from his Hellenistic expressions, and the Aramic names which

appear in his system, he was of Jewish origin.' Rose's *Neander*, ii. 71. *S.*]

² ['The genius of limitation.' It is an idea deeply rooted in the Valentinian system, that since all existence has its foundation in the self-limitation of the Bythos, so also the existence of all created beings depends on limitation. Rose's *Neander*, ii. 72. *Bythos* is the supreme God, called also by Valentinus, αἰὼν τέλειος, προαρχή, ἀρχή. *S.*]

³ [ἐπιστήμη, the sciences, or philosophy. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Δημιουργός, Artificer. *Tr.*]

himself, when he was baptized in Jordan by *John*. The Architect of the world, who perceived that his dominion would be shaken by this divine man, caused him to be seized and crucified. But before Christ came to execution, not only *Jesus* the Son of God, but also the rational soul of Christ, forsook him; so that only his sentient soul and his ethereal body were suspended on the cross. Those who, according to the precepts of Christ, renounce the worship not only of the pagan deities, but likewise of the Jewish God, and submit to have their sentient and concupiscent soul chastised and reformed by reason, shall with both their souls, the rational and the sentient, be admitted to the mansions of the blessed, near to the *Pleroma*. And when all particles of the divine nature, or all souls, shall be separated from matter and purified, then a raging fire shall spread through this material universe, and destroy the whole fabric of nature. For the whole oriental philosophy and the system of the Gnostics, may be reduced to this epitome: This world is composed of both good and evil. Whatever of good there is in it was derived from the supreme God, the parent of light, and will return to him again; and when this takes place, this world will be destroyed.¹

§ 17. The ancients represent the school of *Valentinus* as divided into many branches. Among these were: the *Ptolemaic* sect, whose author, *Ptolemy*, differed from his master respecting the number and nature of the *Æons*; the *Secundian* sect, established by *Secundus*, one of the principal followers of *Valentinus*, who seems to have kept more closely to the oriental philosophy, and to have held to *two first causes* of all things, *light* and *darkness*, or a Prince of good and a Prince of evil; the sect of *Heracleon*, from whose books *Clement* and *Origen* quote much; the sect of *Marcus* and *Calarbasus*, called *Marcosians*, who, according to *Irenæus*, added much that was senseless and absurd to the fictions of *Valentinus*; though it is certain that they did not maintain all that is attributed to them. I pass by other sects, which appear to have originated from the *Valentinian* system. But whether all the sects which are called *Valentinian* actually originated from disciples and followers of *Valentinus*, appears very doubtful to such as consider how great mistakes the ancients have made in stating the origins of the heretics.²

¹ Of the *Valentinian* system, we have a full account in *Irenæus*, *contra Hæres.* i. 1—7. *Tertullian*, *Liber contra Valentinianos*; *Clemens*, *Alex.* passim; and in all the ancient writers on the heresies. Among the moderns, see *Jo. Fr. Buddeus*, *Diss. de Hæresi Valentiniana*; subjoined to his *Introductio in Historiam Philosoph. Ebræorum*: which *Diss.* has occasioned much discussion respecting the origin of this heresy. Some of the moderns have attempted to give a rational explanation of the intricate and absurd system of *Valentinus*. See *Souverein*, *Platonisme dévoilé*, cap. viii. p. 64. *Vitringa*, *Observatt. Sacræ*, i. c. ii. p. 131. *Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manichisme*, p. 548,

&c. *Ja. Basnage*, *Hist. des Juifs*, iii. 729, &c. *Peter Faydit*, *Eclairciss. sur l'Hist. Ecclés. des deux premiers siècles*, p. 12, who also contemplated writing an apology for *Valentinus*. I pass by *Godfrey Arnold*, the patron of all the heretics. But how vain all such attempts must be, is proved by this, that *Valentinus* himself professed that his religion differed fundamentally from that of the other Christians. [Besides the authors above referred to, see *Mosheim*, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 371—389; *Walch*, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 335—386. *Tr.*—*Kaye's Tertullian*, 509; and *Rose's Neander*, ii. 70. *S.*]

² Besides *Irenæus*, and the other ancient

§ 18. Of the smaller and more obscure *Gnostic* sects, of which the ancients tell us little more than the names, and perhaps one or two detached sentiments, it is unnecessary to say anything. Such were the *Adamites*, who are said to have wished to imitate the state of innocence:¹ the *Cainites*, who are represented as paying respect to the memory of *Cain*, *Korah*, *Dathan*, the inhabitants of *Sodom*, and *Judas* the traitor:² the *Abelites*, whom the ancients represent as marrying wives but not procreating children:³ the *Sethites*, who regarded *Seth* as the *Messiah*:⁴ the *Florinians*, who originated at Rome, by means of *Florinus* and *Blastus*:⁵ and many others. Perhaps the ancient Christian doctors divided one sect into several, deceived by the fact of its having several names; they may also have had incorrect information respecting some of them.

§ 19. Among the Gnostics of the Egyptian class, a place must be assigned to the *Ophites* or *Serpentians*, a senseless sect, of which one

writers, see, concerning these sects, Jo. Ern. Grabe, *Spicilegium Patrum et Hæreticorum*, sæcul. ii. p. 69, 82, &c. On the Marcionians, Irenæus is copious, i. 14. That Marcus was out of his senses, is unquestionable; for he must have been deranged, if he could hold even the greater part of the strange fancies which are said to belong to his system. [See also Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 387—401, and A. Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. pt. ii. p. 731—746. *Tr.*]

¹ [See, for an account of them, Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* lib. i. p. 357; iii. 525; vii. 854. Tertullian, *Scorpiae*, in Opp. p. 633, and *contra Prax.* cap. iii. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lii. Opp. i. 459. Theodoret, *Hæret. Fabul.* i. 6. Augustine, *de Hæres.* c. 31. John Damascen, Opp. i. 88; and among the moderns, Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 327—335. P. Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique*, Art. *Adamites* and *Prodicus*. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, &c. ii. 256, Beausobre, *Diss. sur les Adamites*; subjoined to Lenfant's *Histoire des Hussites*.—The accounts of the ancients are contradictory; and several of the moderns doubt whether there ever was a sect who performed their worship in a state of nudity. *Tr.*]

² [All the ancient writers, mentioned in the preceding note, except John Damascen, speak of the Cainites; but what they state is very brief and contradictory. The correctness of their accounts is justly doubted by Bayle (*Dictionnaire Historique*, art. *Cainites*), and others. Origen (*contra Celsum*, lib. iii. p. 119) did not regard them as Christians. Yet they might be a sect of Gnostics, who, holding the God of the Jews for a revolter from the true God, regarded Cain, Dathan, Korah, and others who resisted him, as being very praise-worthy. *Tr.*—‘Of the more obscure Gnostic sects enumerated by Mosheim, Tertullian mentions only the Cainites,

who, according to him, were Nicolaitans under another name.’ Bp. Kaye’s *Tertullian*, 522. *S.*]

³ [The Abelites are mentioned only by Augustine, *de Hæres.* cap. 87; and by the author of the book, *Prædestinatus*, cap. 87. It is represented, that every man married a female child, and every woman a little boy, with whom they lived, and whom they made their heirs; hoping in this way to fulfil, literally what Paul says, 1 Cor. vii. 29, that ‘they that have wives be as though they had none.’ The sect is treated of by Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 607, who doubts whether it were not altogether an imaginary sect. *Tr.*]

⁴ [The Sethites are mentioned by the author of *Prædestinatus*, c. 19, and Philastrius, *de Hæresib.* c. 3. But Rhenferd, (*Diss. de Sethianis*, in his *Opp. Philolog.* p. 165), and Zorn (*Opuscul. Sacra*, i. 614), consider this to be an imaginary sect. See Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 609, &c.; and Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. pt. ii. p. 758, &c. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Florinus and Blastus were, by the ancients, reckoned among the Valentinians. Both were presbyters of Rome, intimate friends, and excommunicated by the Roman bishop, Eleutherus. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 15.) As Florinus, in early life, enjoyed the instruction of Polycarp at Smyrna, and as Irenæus wrote a letter to Blastus concerning the schism at Rome about Easter day, Walch (*loc. cit.* p. 404) supposes they both, and particularly Blastus, were opposed to the views of the Roman church respecting Easter. He also considers it most probable, that Florinus was inclined towards Gnosticism; for Irenæus wrote a book against him, concerning the eight Æons: and he actually had some followers. *Schl.*—That Florinus was a Gnostic is clear from Eusebius. (*H. E.* v. 20.) That Blastus was so, is not so certain. *Tr.*]

Euphrates is said to have been the father. The sect originated among the Jews, before the Christian era. A part of them became professed Christians; the rest retained their former superstition. Hence there were two sects of Ophites, a Christian sect and an anti-Christian. The Christian Ophites held nearly the same absurd notions as the other Egyptian Gnostics concerning *Æons*, the eternity of matter, the creation of the world without the knowledge or consent of the Deity, the rulers of the seven planets who presided over the world, the tyranny of the *Demiurge*, the descent of *Christ* joined to the man *Jesus* into our world to overthrow the kingdom of the *Demiurge*, and the rest. But they held this peculiarity, that they supposed the *serpent* which deceived our first parents, was either *Christ* himself or *Soφία*, concealed under the form of a serpent:¹ and this opinion is said to have induced them to keep some sacred serpents, and to pay them a species of honour. Into such absurdities men might easily fall, who believed the Creator of the world to differ from the supreme God, and thought everything divine that could stand in the *Demiurge's* way.²

¹ ['According to another view, the serpent was itself a symbol, or a veiled appearance of the soul of the world; and those Ophites, who held this doctrine, are the persons who properly bear the name of Ophites, because they worshipped the serpent as a holy symbol, to which a kindred notion of the Egyptian religion might have led them; because in that the serpent is considered as the symbol of Kneph, or the *ἀγαθότατον*, which was similar to the *σοφία* of the Ophites. At all events, it was the soul of the world, by which, either mediately or immediately, the eyes of the first man were opened.' Rose's *Neander*, ii. 101. S.]

² The history and doctrines of this sect, so far as they are known, I have stated in a German work, printed at Helmstadt, 1746, 4to [bearing the title: *Erster Versuch einer unpartheyischen und gründlichen Ketzergeschichte*. Afterwards, J. H. Schumacher published an *Explanation of the obscure and difficult Doctrinal Table of the ancient Ophites*, Wolfenbüttel, 1756, 4to.—Schumacher maintained that the doctrine of the Ophites embraced neither metaphysics nor theology, but merely the history of the Jewish nation couched in hieroglyphics.—Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 447—481, has epitomised both works; and we here give his leading thoughts, in further illustration of this sect.—These people, called in Gr. *Ophites*, in Latin *Serpentians*, were by the Asiatics called *Nahassians*, or *Naasians*. Irenæus (ii. 34), the author of the supplement to Tertullian's book, *de Præscript. Hæret.* (c. 47), Epiphanius (*Hæres.* xxxvii.), Theodoret (*Hæret. Fabul.* i. 14), and Augustine (*de Hæres.* c. 17), account them

Christian heretics. But Origen (*contra Celsum*, vii. § 28) holds them to be not Christians. Yet he speaks of them as pretended Christians, in his *Commentt. on Matth.* t. iii. 851, &c.—Philastrius makes them more ancient than Christianity. It is most probable they were Jewish Gnostics, and that some of them embraced Christianity; so that the sect became divided into *Jewish* and *Christian Ophites*. There are two sources of information on this part of ecclesiastical history. The *first* is the accounts of Irenæus, Epiphanius, and others. The *second* is what Origen tells us (*contra Celsum*, vi. § 33, &c.) concerning the *Diagram* of the Ophites. This Diagram was a tablet, on which the Ophites depicted their doctrines in all sorts of figures, with words annexed. It probably contained the doctrines of the Jewish Ophites, and is dark and unintelligible, unless we may suppose this symbolical representation contained that system, the principal doctrines of which are stated by the ancients. The theological system, both of the Jewish and the Christian Ophites, cannot be epitomised, and must be sought for in Walch, p. 461.—Their serpent-worship consisted in this: they kept a living serpent, which they let out upon the dish, when celebrating the Lord's Supper, to crawl around and over the bread. The priest to whom the serpent belonged, now came near, brake the bread, and distributed to those present. When each had eaten his morsel, he kissed the serpent, which was afterwards confined. When this solemn act, which the Ophites called their perfect sacrifice, was ended, the meeting closed with a hymn of praise to the supreme God, whom the serpent in

§ 20. The numerous evils and discords, which arose from combining the oriental and Egyptian philosophy with the Christian religion, began to increase after the middle of this century, by those who brought the Grecian philosophy with them into the Christian church. As the doctrines held by the Christians respecting the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and respecting the twofold nature of the Saviour, were least of all at agreement with the precepts of this philosophy, they first endeavoured so to explain these doctrines, that they could be comprehended by reason. This was attempted at Rome, by one *Praxeas*, a very distinguished man and a confessor. Discarding all real distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, he taught that the whole Father of all things joined himself to the human nature of *Christ*. Hence his followers were called *Monarchians* and *Patripassians*. Nor was the latter an unsuitable name for them, if *Tertullian* correctly understood their sentiments. For they denominated the *man*, Christ, the *Son* of God; and held that to this Son, the *Father* of the universe, or God, so joined himself, as to be crucified and endure pangs together with the Son. *Praxeas*, however, does not appear to have founded a distinct sect.¹

§ 21. Nearly allied to this opinion, was that which was advanced about the same time, at Rome, by *Theodotus*, a tanner, yet a man of learning and a philosopher; and by one *Artemas*, or *Artemon*, from whom originated the *Artemonites*. For, so far as can be gathered from not very distinct accounts of these men left us by the ancients, they supposed, that when the *man Christ* was born, a certain *divine energy*, or some portion of the divine nature (and not the *person* of the Father, as *Praxeas* imagined), united itself to him. Which of these men preceded the other in time, and whether they both taught the same doctrine, or differed from each other, cannot at this day be decided, so few and obscure are the ancient accounts we have of them. But this is unquestionable, that the disciples of them both applied philosophy and geometry to the explication of the Christian doctrine.²

Paradise had made known to men. But these rites were peculiar to the Christian Ophites, and confined to a small number among them. This worship must have been symbolic. The Ophites had also *Talismans*. *Schl.*—See a lucid account of the Ophites in Neander's *Kirchengesch.* i. pt. ii. p. 746—756. *Tr.*

¹ See *Tertullian, Liber contra Praxeam*; and compare Peter Wesseling, *Probabilia*, c. 26, p. 223, &c. [*Tertullian* (to whom we are indebted for all certain knowledge of the views of *Praxeas*) was not only an obscure writer, but also prejudiced against *Praxeas*, because he had alienated the Roman bishop Victor from Montanus, whose partisan *Tertullian* was. The opposition of *Praxeas* to Montanus doubtless led the former into his error. Montanus had treated of the doctrine of three Persons in the divine essence, and

had insisted on a real distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (*Tertullian contra Praxeam*, c. 13, p. 426). *Praxeas* published his own doctrine in opposition to Montanus. From *Tertullian*, moreover, it appears clearly that *Praxeas* discarded the distinction of Persons in the divine essence; and, as *Tertullian* expresses it, contended for the *monarchy* of God. But how he explained what the Scriptures teach, concerning the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is not so clear. Of the various conceptions we might gather from *Tertullian*, Mosheim gives a full investigation in his *Comment. de Reb. Christ.* &c. p. 426. See also Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 527—546. *Schl.*—See also Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. pt. iii. p. 994, &c. *Tr.*]

² Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 28. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* liv. p. 464. P. Wesseling, *Probabilia*, c. 21, p. 172, &c. [Several persons

§ 22. The same attachment to philosophy induced *Hermogenes*, a painter, to depart from the sentiments of Christians, respecting the origin of the world and the nature of the soul, and to cause disturbance in a part of the Christian community. Regarding *matter* as the source of all evil, he could not believe that God had brought it into existence by his omnipotent volition. He therefore held, that the world, and whatever is in the world, as also souls and spirits, were formed by the Deity out of *eternal* and vicious matter. There is much in this doctrine very difficult to be explained, and not in accordance with the common opinions of Christians. But neither *Tertullian*, who wrote against him, nor others of the ancients, inform us how he explained those Christian doctrines which are repugnant to his opinions.¹

§ 23. In addition to the sects, which may be called the daughters of philosophy, there arose in the reign of *Marcus Antoninus* an illiterate sect, opposed to all learning and philosophy. An obscure man of weak judgment, named *Montanus*, who lived in a poor village of Phrygia called Pepuza, had the folly to suppose himself

occur in the history of the heretics, bearing the name of Theodotus. (1) Theodotus of Byzantium, a tanner; of whom above. (2) Theodotus the younger, disciple of the former, and founder of the sect of Melchisedeckians. This sect derived its name from its holding, that Melchisedec was the power of God, of which the elder Theodotus taught, and superior to Christ, and that he sustained the office of an intercessor for the angels in heaven, as Christ did for us men on earth. (3) Theodotus, the Valentinian. (4) Theodotus the Montanist. Our Theodotus had saved his life during a persecution at Byzantium, by a denial of Christ; and thus had incurred general contempt. To escape from disgrace, he went to Rome. But there his offence became known. To extenuate his fault, he gave out that he regarded Jesus Christ as a mere man, and that it could be no great crime to deny a mere man. He was, therefore, excluded from the church by Victor the bishop. Thus Theodotus came near to the system of the Socinians, and held Christ for a mere man, though a virtuous and upright one. Whether he held the birth of Christ to have been natural or supernatural, the ancient accounts are not agreed. He rejected the Gospel of John; and held his own doctrine to be apostolical, and that of the eternal divinity of Christ to be a novel doctrine. See Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 546—557.—Artemon has, in modern times, become more famous than Theodotus; since Samuel Crell assumed the name of an Artemonite, in order to distinguish himself from the odious Socinians, whose doctrines he did not fully approve. (See his book, with the title: *L. M. Artemonii Initium Evangelii Johannis*

ex antiquitate restitutum; and his other writings.) The history of this Artemon is very obscure. The time when he lived cannot be definitely ascertained; and the history of his doctrine is not without difficulties. It is not doubted that he denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, as held by orthodox Christians. But whether he swerved towards the system of the modern Socinians, or to that of Praxeas, is another question. Mosheim believed the latter; *de Reb. Christ. &c.* 491. But, as this rests on the recent testimony of Gennadius of Marseilles (*de Dogm. Eccles.* c. 3), Dr. Walch (p. 564) calls it in question. See also Jo. Erh. Rappen, *Diss. de Hist. Artemonis et Artemonitarum*, Lips. 1737. *Schl.*—See also Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. pt. iii. p. 996—1000. *Tr.*]

¹ There is extant a tract of Tertullian, *Liber contra Hermogenem*, in which he assails the doctrine of Hermogenes concerning matter and the origin of the world. But another tract of his, *de Censu Animæ*, in which he confuted the opinion of Hermogenes concerning the soul, is lost. [Tertullian is exceedingly severe upon Hermogenes, who was probably his contemporary, and fellow African. Yet he allows that he was an ingenious and eloquent man, and sound in the principal doctrines of Christianity. It seems the morals of Hermogenes gave most offence to Tertullian. He had married repeatedly, and he painted for all customers what they wished. To a Montanist these things were exceedingly criminal. There is no evidence that Hermogenes founded a sect.—See Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ. &c.* p. 432, &c. Walch *Hist. Ketz.* i. 476, &c. and Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. pt. iii. p. 976, &c. *Tr.*]

the *Paraclete* promised by *Christ* to his disciples, and to pretend to utter prophecies under divine inspiration.¹ He attempted no change in the doctrines of religion; but professed to be divinely commissioned to perfect and give efficiency to the moral discipline taught by *Christ* and his apostles; for he supposed that *Christ* and his apostles had conceded too much to the weakness of the people of their age, and thus had given only an incomplete and imperfect rule of life. He therefore would have fasts multiplied and extended, forbade second marriages as illicit, did not allow churches to grant absolution to such as had fallen into the greater sins, condemned all decoration of the body and female ornaments, required polite learning and philosophy to be banished from the church, ordered virgins to be veiled, and maintained that Christians sin most grievously by rescuing their lives

¹ They doubtless err, who tell us that Montanus claimed to be the Holy Spirit. He was not so foolish. Nor do those correctly understand his views whom I have hitherto followed, and who represent him as asserting, that there was divinely imparted to him that very Holy Spirit, or Comforter, who once inspired and animated the apostles. Montanus distinguished the *Paraclete* promised by *Christ* to the apostles, from the Holy Spirit that was poured upon them; and held, that under the name of the *Paraclete*, *Christ* indicated a divine teacher, who would supply certain parts of the religious system which were omitted by the Saviour, and explain more clearly certain other parts, which for wise reasons had been less perfectly taught. Nor was Montanus alone, in making this distinction. For other Christian doctors supposed that the *Paraclete*, whose coming *Christ* had promised, was a divine messenger to men, and different from the Holy Spirit, given to the apostles. In the third century, Manes interpreted the promise of *Christ* concerning the *Paraclete*, in the same manner; and boasted that he himself was that *Paraclete*. And who does not know that Mahomet had the same views, and applied the words of *Christ* respecting the *Paraclete*, to himself? Montanus, therefore, wished to be thought that *Paraclete* of *Christ*, and not the Holy Spirit. The more carefully and attentively we read Tertullian, the greatest of all Montanus' disciples, and the best acquainted with his system, the more clearly will it appear that such were his views. [Mosheim appears to have entertained different opinions respecting Montanus, at different times of life, and the note gives his last. Bp. Kaye, however, considers his first impressions as really correct, and confirms that judgment by citations from Tertullian. From these it sufficiently appears, that Montanus truly did identify the *Paraclete*

and Holy Ghost. Mosheim, it will be observed, leaves his judgment unsupported. The Bishop supplies the following account of Montanus:—'We find in Eusebius the statement of an anonymous author, supposed by Lardner and others to be Asterius Urbanus, who wrote it about thirteen years after the death of Maximilla, one of the prophetesses who accompanied Montanus. From this statement, we learn that he began to prophesy at Ardaban, a village in that part of Mysia which was contiguous to Phrygia, while Gratus was proconsul of Asia; that many persons were induced to believe him divinely inspired, particularly two females, Maximilla and Priscilla, or Prisca, who also pretended to possess the same prophetic gifts: that the fallacy of their pretensions was exposed, and their doctrine condemned, and that they themselves were excommunicated by different synods held in Asia. The same anonymous author adds, that Montanus and Maximilla hanged themselves; and that Theodotus, one of the earliest supporters of their cause, was taken up into the air, and dashed to pieces by the Spirit of falsehood, to whom he had consigned himself, under the expectation that he should be conveyed into heaven. Our author, however, tells us that he does not vouch for the truth of either of these stories.' (Kaye's *Tertullian*, 22, 12.) It is easy to account for the popularity of Montanus. He had prophecies and supernatural converse for the credulous and vain, rigid austerities for the gloomy and severe. S.—Montanus did not 'really assert himself to be the Holy Ghost or *Paraclete*; but he taught that the promise of the Comforter was not limited to the apostles; that having been imperfectly performed in them it was now more fully realised in himself and his associates.' (Robertson, i. 71.) *Ed.*]

by flight, or redeeming them with money in time of persecution. I pass by others of his precepts, equally austere and rigid.

§ 24. A man who professed to be a holier moralist than *Christ* himself, and who would obtrude his severe precepts upon Christians for divine commands and oracles, could not be endured in the Christian church. Besides, his dismal predictions of the Roman state's approaching downfall, and the like, might bring the Christian community into imminent danger. He was therefore, first by the decisions of some councils, and afterwards by one of the whole church, excluded from all connexion with that body. But the severity of his discipline itself led many persons of no mean condition to put confidence in him. Preeninent among these were two opulent ladies, *Priscilla* and *Maximilla*, who themselves, with others, uttered prophecies, after the example of their master, who called himself the *Paraclete*. Hence it was easy for *Montanus* to found a new church, which was first established at *Pepuza*, a little town of Phrygia, but which spread in process of time through Asia, Africa, and a part of Europe. Of all his followers, the most learned and distinguished was *Tertullian*, a man of genius, but austere and gloomy by nature; who defended the cause of his preceptor, by many energetic and severe publications.¹

¹ See Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 16, and especially *Tertullian*, in his numerous books; and then all writers, both ancient and modern, who have treated professedly of the sects of the early ages. Quite recently, and with attention and great erudition, the history of the Montanists has been illustrated by Theoph. Wernsdorf, in his *Commentatio de Montanistis sæculi secundi vulgo creditis hæreticis*. Dantzick, 1751, 4to.—[The Montanists were also called Phrygians, or Cataphrygians, from the country where they resided and originated; also Pepuzians, from the town where Montanus had his habitation, and which he pretended was the New Jerusalem spoken of in the *Revelation* of St. John. It appears likewise, that from *Priscilla* they were called Priscillianists: though this name, on account of its ambiguity, has in modern times been disused. *Tertullian* denominated those of his faith the *Spiritual* (*Spirituales*); and its opposers the *Carnal* (*Psychikoi*); because the former admitted Montanus' inspirations of the Holy Spirit, which the latter rejected.—The time when Montanus began to disturb the church is much debated. Those who follow Eusebius, who is most to be relied upon, place this movement in the year 171, or 172. Wernsdorf's conjecture that Montanus was the bishop

of *Pepuza*, is not improbable. He and *Priscilla* and *Maximilla* pretended to have divine revelations, which the *Paraclete* imparted to them, in order to supply by them what further instruction the Christian church needed. The instruction, said they, which the Holy Spirit gives to men, is progressive. In the Old Testament, instruction was in its infancy. Christ and his apostles advanced it to its youthful stature. By Montanus and his coadjutors, it is brought to its perfect manhood. In the Old Testament God conceded much to the hardness of the people's hearts, and Christ was indulgent to the weakness of the flesh, but the Comforter is unsparing to both, and presents the virtues of Christians in their full splendour.—Their revelations related to no new doctrines of faith, but only to rules of practice. Some of them, too, were historical. But all these revelations seem to have been the effect of their melancholy temperament, and of an excessively active imagination.—See concerning *Tertullian*, Hamberger's account of the principal writers, ii. 492, and J. G. Walch, *Hist. Eccles. N. Test.* p. 648, &c. and concerning the Montanists, Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 611, &c. *Schl.*—Also Neander, *Kirchen-gesch.* i. pt. iii, p. 870—893. *Tr.*]

THIRD CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Rights and immunities of Christians enlarged — § 2. Under various emperors. Good-will of Alexander towards Christ — § 3. Other emperors favourable to the Christians. The religion of the emperor Philip — § 4. The number of Christians augmented : from causes, partly, divine — § 5. and, partly, human — § 6. Countries added to the kingdom of Christ — § 7. State of the church in Gaul, Germany.

§ 1. THAT Christians suffered very great evils in this century, and were not perfectly secure during any part of it, admits of no controversy. For, not to mention the popular tumults raised against them by the pagan priests, the governors and magistrates could persecute them, without violating the ancient laws of the empire, as often as either superstition, or avarice, or cruelty prompted. Yet it is no less certain that the rights and liberties of the Christians were increased more than many have supposed. In the army, in the court, and among all ranks, there were many Christians whom no one molested at all : and under most of the Roman emperors who reigned in this century, Christianity presented no obstacle to the attainment of public honours. In many places also, with the full knowledge of the emperors and magistrates, they had certain houses in which they assembled for the worship of God. Yet it is probable, nay, more than probable, that the Christians commonly purchased this security and these liberties with money ; although some of the emperors had very kind feelings towards them, and were not greatly opposed to their religion.

§ 2. *Antoninus*, surnamed *Caracalla*, the son of *Severus*, came to the throne in the year 211 ; and during the six years of his reign he neither oppressed the Christians himself, nor suffered others to oppress

them.¹ *Antoninus Heliogabalus*,² though of a most abandoned moral character, had no hostility towards the Christians.³ His successor, *Alexander Severus*,⁴ an excellent prince, did not, indeed, repeal the laws which had been enacted against the Christians, so that instances occur of Christians suffering death in his reign; yet, from the influence of his mother, *Julia Mamaea*, to whom he was greatly attached, he showed kind feelings towards them in various ways, and whenever occasion was offered; and even paid some worship and honour to our Saviour.⁵ For *Julia* thought most favourably of the Christian religion; and at one time invited to court *Origen*, the celebrated Christian doctor, that she might profit by his conversation. But those who conclude that *Julia* and *Alexander* actually embraced Christianity, have not testimony to adduce which is unexceptionable. Yet it is certain that *Alexander* thought the Christian religion deserved toleration beyond others; and regarded its author as worthy to be ranked among the extraordinary men who were divinely moved.⁶

§ 3. Under *Gordian*⁷ the Christians lived in tranquillity. His successors, the *Philips*, father and son,⁸ showed themselves so friendly to the Christians, that by many they were supposed to be Christians. And there are arguments which may render it probable that these emperors did, though secretly and covertly, embrace Christianity. But as these arguments are balanced by others equally strong and imposing, the question respecting the religion of *Philip* the Arabian, and his son, which has exercised the sagacity of so many learned

¹ [From a passage in Tertullian (*ad Scapul.* cap. 4), asserting that Caracalla had a Christian nurse: *lacte Christiano educatum fuisse*: and from one in Spartianus (life of Caracalla, in *Scriptor. Histor. Aug.* i. 707, c. 1), asserting that he was much attached to a Jewish play-fellow, when he was seven years old; it has been inferred that he was half a Christian, and on that account was indulgent to the followers of Christ. But it is much more probable that they purchased his indulgence with their gold. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 460. Tr.]

² [A.D. 218—222. Tr.]

³ Lampridius, *Vita Heliogabali*, cap. 3, p. 796. [Dicebat præterea (Imperator), Judeorum et Samaritanorum religiones et Christianam devotionem illuc (Romam) transferendam, ut omnium culturarum secretum Heliogabali sacerdotium teneret: which Dr. Mosheim (*de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 460) understands to mean, that Heliogabalus wished the Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian religions to be freely tolerated at Rome, so that the priests of his order might understand all the arcana of them, having them daily before their eyes. Tr.]

⁴ [A.D. 222—235. Tr.]

⁵ See Lampridius, *de Vita Severi*, c. 29, p. 930, and Car. Hen. Zeibich, *Diss. de Christo ab Alexandro in lavario culto*; which is found in the *Miscell. Lips.* Nov. iii. 42, &c. [Most of the modern writers make *Julia Mamaea* to have been a Christian. See J. R. Wetstein's preface to Origen's *Dial. contra Marcionitas*. But the ancient writers, Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 21), and Jerome (*de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 54), express themselves dubiously. The former calls her *θεοσεβειστὴν*, and the latter *religiosam* (devout); and both state that she invited Origen to her court, then at Antioch, in order to hear him discourse on religion. But neither of them intimates that she obeyed his precepts and adopted the Christian faith. And in the life of *Julia*, there are clear indications of superstition, and of reverence for the pagan gods. *Schl.* from Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 461.]

⁶ See Fred. Spanheim, *Diss. de Lucii Britonum regis, Juliae Mamaeae, et Philipporum, conversionibus*, Opp. ii. 400. P. E. Jablonski, *Diss. de Alexandro Severo sacris Christianis per Gnosticos initiato*, in *Miscellan. Lips.* Nov. iv. 56, &c.

⁷ [A.D. 236—244. Tr.]

⁸ [A.D. 244—249. Tr.]

men, must be left undecided.¹ At least, neither party has adduced any evidence, either from testimony or from facts, which is too strong to be invalidated. Among the subsequent emperors of this century, *Gallienus*² and some others likewise, if they did not directly favour the Christian cause, at least did not retard it.

§ 4. This friendship of great men, and especially of emperors, was undoubtedly not last among the human causes which everywhere enlarged the church's boundaries. But other causes, and some of them divine, must be added. Among the *divine* causes, besides the inherent energy of heavenly truth, and the piety and constancy of the Christian teachers, especially noticeable is that extraordinary providence of God, which, we are informed, excited many persons, by means of dreams and visions, who before were either wholly thoughtless, or alienated from Christianity, to come unexpectedly forward, and enrol their names among the followers of *Christ*.³ To this must be added the curing of diseases, and other miracles, which very many Christians still performed, by invoking the name of the Saviour.⁴ Yet the number of miracles was less in this age than in the preceding; which may be ascribed not only to the wisdom of God, but also to his justice, which would not suffer men to make gain by the powers divinely given them.⁵

§ 5. Among the *human* causes which aided the progress of Christianity, may doubtless be reckoned the translation of the Scriptures into various languages, the labours of *Origen* in disseminating copies of them, and various books composed by wise men. No less efficacy is to be ascribed to the beneficence of Christians towards those whose religion they abhorred. The idolaters must have had hearts of stone, not to have been softened and brought to have more friendly feelings towards the people, whose great sympathy for the poor, kindness to enemies, care of the sick, readiness to redeem captives, and numerous other kind offices, proved them to be deserving of the love and gratitude of mankind. If, what I would not pertinaciously deny, pious frauds and impostures deserve a place among the causes of the extension of Christianity, they doubtless hold the lowest place, and were employed only by a few.

§ 6. That the boundaries of the church were extended in this century, no one calls in question; but in what manner, by whom, and in what countries, is not equally manifest. *Origen* taught the religion which he professed himself to a tribe of Arabs: I suppose

¹ See Spanheim, *de Christianismo Philipporum*, Opp. ii. 400. (P. de la Faye), *Entretiens historiques sur le Christianisme de l'Empereur Philippe*, Utrecht, 1692, 12mo. Mammachius, *Origines et Antiqu. Christianæ*, ii. 252, &c. See J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Evang.* p. 252, &c. [and Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 471.—The most important ancient testimonies are Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 34, and *Chronicon*, ann. 246. Jerome, *de Script. Illust.* c. 54. Tr.]

² [A. D. 260—268. Tr.]

³ See Origen, *adv. Celsum*, lib. i. p. 35. *Homil. in Luc.* vii. Opp. ii. 216, ed. Basil. Tertullian, *de Anima*, cap. 14, p. 348, ed. Rigaltii. Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 5, and others.

⁴ Origen, *adv. Celsum*, l. i. p. 5, 7. Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 7. Cyprian, *Ep. i. ad Donatum*, p. 3, and the Note of S. Baluze there, p. 376. [And Note on cent. ii. p. i. c. 1, § 8 of this work. Tr.]

⁵ W. Spencer, *Notes on Origen adv. Celsum*, p. 6, 7.

them to have been some of the wandering Arabs who live in tents.¹ The Goths, a fierce and warlike people, that inhabited Mœsia and Thrace, and made perpetual incursions into the neighbouring provinces, received a knowledge of *Christ* from certain Christian priests whom they carried away from Asia. As those priests, by the sanctity of their lives, and their miracles, acquired respectability and authority among these marauders, who were entirely illiterate, such a change was produced among them, that a great part of the nation professed Christianity, and in some measure laid aside their savage manners.²

§ 7. To the few and small Christian churches in Gaul, founded in the second century, by certain Asiatic teachers, more and larger ones were added in this century, after the times of *Decius*.³ In the reign of this emperor, those seven devout men, *Dionysius*, *Gatian*, *Trophimus*, *Paul*, *Saturninus*, *Marial*, and *Stremonius* migrated to this country, and amidst various perils founded the churches of *Paris*, *Tours*, *Arles*,⁴ and other places. And their disciples gradually spread the Christian doctrine throughout Gaul.⁵ To this age, likewise, must be referred the origin of the German churches of *Cologne*, *Treves*, *Metz*,⁶ and others; the fathers of which were *Eucharius*, *Valerius*, *Maternus*, *Clement*, and others.⁷ The Scots also say that their country was enlightened with the light of Christianity in this century; which does not appear improbable in itself, but cannot be put beyond controversy by any certain testimony.⁸

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 19. [But Semler, *Hist. Eccl. Selecta*, cap. i. p. 59, supposes they were not wandering Arabs. *Tr.*]

² Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 6. Paul Diaconus, *Hist. Miscellan.* l. ii. c. 14. Philostorgius, *H. E.* ii. 5. [See Mosheim, *de Rebus Chr.* &c. p. 449, and below cent. iv. p. i. c. 1, § 21. *Ed.*]

³ [A.D. 250. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Narbonne, Toulouse, Limoges, Clermont. *Tr.*]

⁵ Gregory Turonens. *Historia Francor.* i. 28, p. 23. Theod. Ruinart, *Acta Mar-*

tyrum sincera, p. 109, &c. [See Note on cent. ii. pt. i. ch. 1, § 5 of this work. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Tongres, Liege. *Tr.*]

⁷ Aug. Calmet, *Histoire de Lorraine*, i. Diss. i. p. vii. &c. Jo. Nicol. de Hontheim, *Historia Trevirensis*. [See also, Notes ¹ and ² on cent. ii. pt. i. ch. 1, § 4 of this work. *Tr.*]

⁸ See Ussher and Stillingfleet, on the *Origin and Antiquities of the British Churches*; and Geo. Mackenzie, *de Regali Scotorum Prosapia*, cap. viii. p. 119, &c.

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The persecution of Severus — § 2. Of Maximinus, the Thracian — § 3. The cruelty of Decius led many Christians to deny Christ — § 4. Controversies in the church on this subject, *Libelli pacis* — § 5. Persecutions of Gallus and Volusian — § 6. Of Valerian — § 7. State of the church under Gallienus, Claudius, and Aurelian — § 8. Attempts of the philosophers against the Christians — § 9. Comparisons of some philosophers with Christ — § 10. Injury thence arising — § 11. Attempts of the Jews against the Christians.

§ 1. IN the commencement of this century, the Christians were variously afflicted in many of the Roman provinces; but their calamity was increased in the year 203, when the emperor *Severus*, who was otherwise not hostile to them, enacted a law, that no person should abandon the religion of his fathers for that of the Christians, or even for that of the Jews.¹ Although this law did not condemn [the existing] Christians, but merely restrained the propagation of their religion, yet it afforded to rapacious and unjust governors and judges great opportunity for troubling the Christians, and for putting many of the poor to death, in order to induce the rich to avert their danger by money. Hence, after the passing of this law, very many Christians in Egypt, and in other parts of both Asia and Africa, were cruelly slain; and among them were *Leonidas*, the father of *Origen*; the two celebrated African ladies, *Perpetua* and *Felicitas*, whose Acts² have come down to us:³ also *Potamiana*, a virgin; *Marcella*, and others of both sexes, whose names were held in high honour in the subsequent ages.

§ 2. From the death of⁴ *Severus*, till the reign of *Maximin*, called *Thrax* from the country which gave him birth,⁵ the condition of Christians was every where tolerable, and in some places prosperous. But *Maximin*, who had slain *Alexander Severus*, an emperor peculiarly friendly to the Christians, fearing lest the Christians should avenge the death of their patron, ordered their bishops, and particularly those that he knew to have been the friends and intimates of *Alexander*, to be seized and put to death.⁶ During his reign, therefore, many and atrocious injuries were brought upon the Christians. For although the edict of the tyrant related only to the bishops and

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 1. Spartianus, *Vita Severi*, c. 16, 17.

² [Martyrdom. *Tr.*]

³ Theod. Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum sincera*, p. 90, &c. [See an affecting account of the sufferings of these and other martyrs, in

the reign of Severus, in Milner's *Hist. of the Church*, cent. iii. ch. v. p. 231, &c. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Septimius. *Tr.*]

⁵ [A.D. 211, to A.D. 235. *Tr.*]

⁶ Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 28. Orosius, *Histor.* vii. 19, p. 509.

the ministers of religion, yet its influence reached further, and incited the pagan priests, the populace, and the magistrates, to assail Christians of all orders.¹

§ 3. This storm was followed by many years of peace and tranquillity.² But when *Decius Trajan* came to the imperial throne, A. D. 249, war, in all its horrors, again burst upon the Christians. For this emperor, excited either by fear of them, or by attachment to the ancient superstition, published terrible edicts, by which the governors were commanded, on pain of forfeiting their own lives, either to exterminate all Christians utterly, or bring them back by pains and tortures to the religion of their fathers. During the two succeeding years, a great multitude of Christians, in all the Roman provinces, were cut off by various species of punishment and suffering.³ This persecution was more cruel and terrific than any that preceded it; and immense numbers, dismayed, not so much by the fear of death, as by that of the long continued tortures, by which the magistrates endeavoured to overcome the constancy of Christians, professed to renounce *Christ*; and procured for themselves safety, either by sacrificing, or by offering incense to idols, or by certificates purchased with money. And hence arose the opprobrious names of *Sacrificati*, *Thurificati*, and *Libellatici*, by which the lapsed were designated.⁴

§ 4. From the prevalence of Christian defection under *Decius*, great commotions and embarrassing contentions arose everywhere in the church. For the lapsed wished to be restored to Christian fellowship, without submitting to that severe *penance* which the laws of the church prescribed; and some of the bishops favoured their wishes, while others opposed them.⁵ In Egypt and Africa, many persons, to obtain more ready pardon of their offences, resorted to the intercession of the *martyrs*, and obtained from them *letters of recommendation*,⁶ that is, papers in which the dying martyrs declared that

¹ Origen, tom. xxviii. in Matth. Opp. i. 137. Firmilian, in Opp. Cypriani, Ep. 75, p. 140, &c.

² [From A. D. 237—249. Tr.]

³ Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 39, 41. Gregory Nyssen, *Vita Thaumaturgi*, Opp. iii. 568, &c. Cyprian, *de Lapsis*, in Opp. p. 182, &c. [Eusebius attributes the persecution by Decius, to his hatred of Philip, his predecessor, whom he had murdered, and who was friendly to the Christians. Gregory attributes it to the emperor's zeal for idolatry. Both causes might have prompted him.—The persecuting edict is not now extant; that which was published by Medon, Toulouse, 1664, 4to, is probably unauthentic. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 476 &c. Tr.]

⁴ See Prudentius Maran, *Life of Cyprian*, prefixed to Cypriani Opp. § vi. p. liv. &c. [See also Milner's *Hist. of the Church*, cent. iii. ch. 8, and ch. 11, vol. i.—This persecution was more terrible than any preceding one, because it extended over the whole empire, and because its object was to

worry the Christians into apostasy by extreme and persevering torture.—The Certificated, or *Libellatici*, are supposed to be such as purchased *certificates* from the corrupt magistrates, in which it was declared that they were pagans, and had complied with the demands of the law, when neither of these was fact. To purchase such a certificate was not only to be partaker in a fraudulent transaction, but it was to prevaricate before the public in regard to Christianity, and was inconsistent with that open confession of Christ before men, which he himself requires. On the purport of these letters, see Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 482—489. Tr.—It is said in the latter of these pages, that we have no mention of the *libellus*, or *bill of security*, before the persecuting edict of Decius. S.]

⁵ Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 44. Cyprian, *Epistolæ*, passim.

⁶ [*Libelli pacis*. Letters of reconciliation and peace. Mach.]

they considered the persons worthy of their communion, and wished them to be received and treated as brethren. Some bishops and presbyters were too ready to admit offenders who produced such letters. But *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, a decided and strenuous man, though far from willing to derogate from the honour of the martyrs, was nevertheless opposed to this excessive lenity, and wished to limit the effects of these letters of recommendation. Hence there arose a sharp contest between him and the martyrs, confessors, presbyters, the lapsed and the people; from which he came off victorious.¹

§ 5. The successors of *Decius*, namely, *Gallus* and his son *Volusian*,² renewed the persecution against the Christians, which seemed to be subsiding:³ and, as their edicts were accompanied by public calamities, particularly by a pestilential disease which spread through many provinces, the Christians had again to undergo much suffering in divers countries.⁴ For the pagan priests persuaded the populace that the gods visited the people with so many calamities on account of the Christians. The next emperor, *Valerian*, stilled the commotion, A. D. 254, and restored tranquillity to the church.

§ 6. Till the fifth year of his reign, *Valerian* was very kind to the Christians; but suddenly, in the year 257, by the persuasion of *Macrianus*, a most superstitious person, who was his prime minister, he prohibited the Christians from holding meetings, and ordered the bishops and other teachers into exile. The next year he published a far more severe edict; so that no small number of Christians, in all the provinces of the Roman empire, were put to death, and often exposed to punishments worse than death. Eminent among the martyrs in this tempest were *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, *Sixtus*,

¹ Gab. Albaspinæus, *Observat. Eccles.* lib. i. obs. xx. p. 94. Jo. Dallæus, *de Pœnis et Satisfactionibus humanis*, vii. 16, p. 706. The whole history of this controversy must be gathered from the *Epistles* of *Cyprian*. [*Tertullian*, *de Pudicitia*, cap. 22, and *ad Martyres*, cap. 1, makes the earliest mention of these letters; whence it is conjectured, that they first began to be used about the middle of the second century.—By *martyrs* here must be understood persons already under sentence of death for their religion, or, at least, such as had endured some suffering, and were still in prison and uncertain what would befall them. In that age, when martyrs were almost idolised, and the doctrines of repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, imperfectly understood, the propriety of such letters was unquestioned, and their influence very great. Yet the abuses of them were felt by the more discerning. Mosheim (*de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 490—497) has collected the following facts respecting their misuse. (1) They were given, with little or no discrimination, to all applicants. Cy-

prian, *Ep.* 14, p. 24, ep. 10, p. 20.—(2) They often did not express definitely the names of the persons recommended, but said, 'Receive A. B. (cum suis) and his friends.' Ibid. ep. 10, p. 20, 21.—(3) Sometimes a martyr, before his death, commissioned some friend to give letters, in his name, to all applicants. Ibid. ep. 21, p. 30, ep. 22, p. 31.—(4) Some presbyters obeyed these letters without consulting the bishop, and thus subverted ecclesiastical order. Ibid. ep. 27, p. 38, ep. 10, p. 20, ep. 40, p. 52, ep. 22, p. 31, 32. It is easy to see what effects would follow, when the almost deified martyrs, of every age, and sex, and condition, felt themselves to possess authority almost divine, and were besieged by a host of persons writhing under the rigours of the ancient discipline. *Tr.*]

² [A. D. 251—253. *Tr.*]

³ Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 1. *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 57, 58.

⁴ See *Cyprian*, *Liber ad Demetrianum*. [*Milner's Hist. of the Church*, cent. iii. ch. 12, p. 308. *Tr.*]

bishop of Rome, *Laurentius*, a deacon at Rome, who was roasted before a slow fire, and others. But *Valerian*, being taken captive, in a war against the Persians, his son *Gallienus*, in the year 260, restored peace to the church.¹

§ 7. Under *Gallienus*, therefore, who reigned with his brother eight years,² and under his successor *Claudianus*, who reigned two years,³ the condition of the Christians was tolerable, yet not altogether tranquil and happy. Nor did *Aurelian*, who came to the throne A.D. 270, undertake to disquiet them during four years. But in the fifth year of his reign, prompted either by his own superstition, or by that of others, he prepared for war against them. However, before his edicts had been published over the whole empire, he was assassinated in Thrace, A.D. 275.⁴ Hence, few Christians were cut off under him. The remainder of this century—if we except some few instances of the injustice, the avarice, or the superstition of the governors⁵—passed away, without any great troubles or injuries done to Christians living among Romans.

§ 8. While the emperors and provincial governors were assailing Christians with the sword and with edicts, the Platonic philosophers, before described fought them with disputations, books, and stratagems. And the more was to be feared from them, because they approved and adopted many doctrines and institutions of the Christians, and, following the example of their master, *Ammonius*, attempted to amalgamate the old religion and the new. At the head of this sect, in this century, was *Porphyry*, a Syrian, or Tyrian, who composed a long work against the Christians, which was afterwards destroyed by the imperial laws.⁶ He was undoubtedly an acute, ingenious, and learned man, as appears from his works which are extant; but he was not a formidable enemy to the Christians. For he had more imagination and superstition than sound argument and judgment; as his books that remain, and the history of his life, will show, without recurrence to the fragments of his work against the Christians, which are preserved, and which are unworthy of a wise and upright man.

§ 9. Among the wiles and stratagems by which this sect endeavoured to subvert the authority of the Christian religion, this deserves to be particularly mentioned—that they drew comparisons between the life, miracles, and transactions of our Saviour, and the history of the

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 10, 11. *Acta Cypriani*, in Ruinart's *Acta Martyrum sincera*, p. 216. Cyprian, *Epist.* 77, p. 178, epist. 82, p. 165, ed. Baluz. [Milner's *Hist. of the Church*, cent. iii. ch. 16, p. 347. *Tr.*]

² [A.D. 260—268. *Tr.*]

³ [A.D. 268—270. *Tr.*]

⁴ Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 30. Lactantius, *de Mortibus Persecutor.* cap. 6.

⁵ One example is, the iniquity of the Cæsar, Galerius Maximian, near the end of the century, who persecuted the soldiers and servants of his palace, that professed Christianity. See Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. 1 and 4.

⁶ See Lu. Holstein, *de Vita Porphyrii*, cap. 11. J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Evang.* p. 154. J. F. Buddeus, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, lib. ii. p. 877, &c. [and Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 236, &c. His fifteen *Books against the Christians* were condemned to be burned by Theodosius II. and Valentinian III. A.D. 449 (see the *Codex Justinianus de Summa Trinitate*, l. i. tit. i. cap. 3). The work was answered by Methodius, Eusebius, Apollinaris, and Philostorgius; but the answers are lost. Of the work of Porphyry, extracts are preserved by Eusebius, Jerome, and others. *Tr.*]

ancient philosophers; and endeavoured to persuade the unlearned and women, that those philosophers were in no respect inferior to *Christ*. With such views, *Archytas* of Tarentum, *Pythagoras* and *Apollonius Tyaneus*, a Pythagorean philosopher, were brought again upon the stage, and exhibited to the public dressed very much like *Christ* himself. The life of *Pythagoras* was written by *Porphry*.¹ The life of *Apollonius*, whose travels and prodigies were talked of by the vulgar, and who was a crafty mountebank, and the ape of *Pythagoras*, was composed by *Philostratus*, the first rhetorician of the age, in a style which is not inelegant. The reader of the work will readily perceive, that the philosopher is compared with our Saviour; and yet he will wonder that any man of sound sense could have been deceived by the scandalous tales and fictions of the writer.²

§ 10. But as nothing is so irrational that it cannot find patrons among the weak and ignorant, who regard words more than arguments, there were not a few who were ensnared by these silly attempts of the philosophers. Some were induced by these stratagems to abandon the Christian religion which they had embraced. Others, being told that there was little difference between the ancient religion, rightly explained and restored to its purity, and the religion which *Christ* really taught, not that corrupted form of it which his disciples professed, concluded it best for them to remain among those who worshipped the gods. Some were led by those comparisons of *Christ* with the ancient heroes and philosophers, to frame for themselves a kind of mixed or compound religion. Witness, among others, *Alexander Severus*,³ who esteemed *Christ*, *Orpheus*, *Apollonius* (and who not?), all worthy of equal honour.

11. The *Jews* were reduced so low, that they could not, as formerly, excite in the magistrates any great hatred against the Christians. Yet they were not wholly inactive, as appears from the books written by *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* against them. There occur also in the Christian fathers several complaints of the hatred and the machinations of the *Jews*.⁴ During the persecution of *Severus*, one *Domninus* abandoned Christianity for Judaism, undoubtedly to avoid the punishments that were decreed against the Christians. *Serapion* endeavoured to recall him to his duty by a particular treatise.⁵ This example shows, that while the Christians were in trouble, the *Jews* were in safety; and, therefore, though greatly depressed, they had not lost all power of doing injury to the Christians.

¹ [And in the next century by *Jamblichus*. That both biographers had the same object, is shown by *Lud. Küster*, *Adnot. ad Jamblich.* cap. 2, p. 7, and cap. 19, p. 78. *Schl.*]

² See *Godfr. Olearius*, *Præfat. ad Philostrati vitam Apollonii*; and *Mosheim*, *Notes on Cudworth's Intellectual System*, p. 304, 309, 311, 834 [also *Brucker's Historia Crit. Philos.* ii. 98, &c. and *Enfield's Abridgment of Brucker*, ii. 42, &c. *N. Lardner's Works*, viii. 256—292.—*Apol-*

lonius was born about the beginning, and died near the close, of the first century. He travelled over all the countries from Spain to India; and drew much attention by his sagacious remarks, and by his pretensions to superhuman knowledge and powers. He was a man of genius, but vainglorious, and a great impostor. *Tr.*]

³ [The emperor. *Tr.*]

⁴ *Hippolytus*, *Sermo in Susann. et Daniel*, *Opp.* i. 274, 276.

⁵ *Eusebius*, *H. E.* vi. 12.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. Decay of learning — § 2. State of philosophy, especially the Platonic. Plotinus — § 3. This philosophy prevails everywhere — § 4. Different sects of it — § 5. State of learning among Christians.

§ 1. LITERATURE, which had suffered much in the preceding century, in this lost nearly all its glory. Among the Greeks, with the exception of *Dionysius Longinus*, an excellent rhetorician, *Dion Cassius*, a fine historian, and a few others, scarcely any writers appeared who can be much commended for genius or erudition. In the western provinces, still smaller was the number of men truly lettered and well-informed; although schools yet flourished everywhere devoted to intellectual cultivation. Very few of the emperors, indeed, favoured learning, civil wars keeping the state almost constantly in commotion, and the perpetual incursions of barbarous nations into the most cultivated provinces, extinguished, with the public tranquillity, even the thirst for knowledge.¹

§ 2. As for the philosophers, every sect of Grecian philosophy yet had some adherents that were not contemptible, and who are in part mentioned by *Longinus*.² But the school of *Ammonius*, the origin of which has been already stated, gradually cast all others into the back ground. From Egypt it spread in a short time over nearly the whole Roman empire, and drew after it almost all persons who took any interest in things of a nature purely intellectual. This prosperity was owing especially to *Plotinus*, the most distinguished disciple of *Ammonius*, a man of the greatest acuteness, and by his very nature formed for any abstruse investigation. For he taught, first in Persia, then at Rome, and in Campania, to vast concourses of youth; and embodied precepts in various books, a great part of which has come down to us.³

¹ See *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, par les Moines Bénédictins. tom. i. pt. ii. p. 317, &c.

² In Porphyry's *Life of Plotinus*, cap. 20, p. 128, ed. Fabricii.

³ See Porphyrii, *Vita Plotini*, republished by J. A. Fabricius, in *Biblioth. Græca*, iv. 91. Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, tom. iii. v. *Plotinus*, p. 2330; and Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 217, &c.

§ 3. It is almost incredible what a number of pupils in a short time issued from the school of this man. But among them, no one is more celebrated than *Porphyry*, a Syrian, who spread over Sicily and many other countries the system of his master, enlarged with new inventions and more elaborately polished.¹ At Alexandria, scarcely any other philosophy than this was publicly taught from the times of *Ammonius* down to the sixth century. It was introduced into Greece by one *Plutarch*, who was educated at Alexandria, and who re-established the Academy at Athens, which subsequently embraced many very renowned philosophers, who will hereafter be mentioned.²

§ 4. The character of this philosophy has already been explained as far as was compatible with the brevity of our work. It is here proper to add, that all who were addicted to it did not hold the same opinions, but differed from each other on several points. This diversity naturally arose from that principle which the whole sect kept in sight; namely, that truth was to be pursued without restraint, and to be gleaned out of all systems. Hence the Alexandrian philosophers sometimes would receive what those of Athens rejected. Yet there were certain leading doctrines, which served as foundations to the system, that no one who claimed the name of a Platonist, dared to call in question. Such were the doctrines of one God, the source of all things, of the eternity of the world, of the dependence of matter on God, of the plurality of Gods, of the method of explaining the popular superstitions, and some others.

§ 5. The estimation in which human learning should be held, was a question on which the Christians were about equally divided. For, while many thought that the literature and writings of the Greeks ought to receive attention, there were others who contended that true piety and religion were endangered by such studies. But the friends of philosophy and literature gradually acquired the ascendancy. To this issue *Origen* contributed very much; who, having early imbibed the principles of the New Platonism, inauspiciously applied them to theology, and earnestly recommended them to the numerous youth who attended on his instructions. And the greater the influence of this man, which quickly spread over the whole Christian world, the more readily was his method of explaining the sacred doctrines propagated. Some of the disciples of *Plotinus* also connected themselves with the Christians, yet retained the leading sentiments of their master:³ and these undoubtedly laboured to disseminate their principles around them, and to instil them into the minds of the uninformed.

¹ Lu. Holstenius, *Vita Porphyrii*, republished by Fabricius, in *Biblioth. Gr.*—[‘Porphyry was first the disciple of Longinus, author of the justly celebrated treatise on the Sublime. But having passed from Greece to Rome, where he heard Plotinus, he was so charmed with the genius and

penetration of this philosopher, that he attached himself entirely to him. See Plotin. *Vit.* p. 3. Eunap. c. 2, p. 17.’ *Maccl.*]

² Marinus, *V. Procli*, c. 11, 12, p. 25, &c.

³ Augustine, *Epistola* lvi. ad. *Dioscor.* Opp. ii. 260.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Form of the government of the Church — § 2. What rank the bishop of Rome held in this century — § 3. Gradual progress towards a hierarchy — § 4. The vices of the clergy — § 5. Hence the inferior orders of the clergy — § 6. Marriage of the clergy. Their concubines — § 7. The principal writers, Grecian and Oriental — § 8. Latin writers.

§ 1. THE form of ecclesiastical government which had been already adopted was more confirmed and strengthened, both as regards individual churches and the whole society of Christians. He must be ignorant of the history and of the monuments of this age, who can deny that a person bearing the title of *bishop* presided over each church in the larger cities, and managed its public concerns with some degree of authority, yet having the *presbyters* for his council, and taking the voice of the whole people on subjects of any moment.¹ It is equally certain, that one bishop in each province was greater than the rest in rank and in some privileges. This was necessary for maintaining that consociation of churches which had been introduced in the preceding century, and for holding councils more conveniently and easily. Yet it must be added, that the prerogatives of these principal bishops were not everywhere accurately ascertained; nor did the bishop of the chief city in a province always hold the rank of first bishop. This also is beyond controversy, that the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, as presiding over the primitive and apostolic churches in the greater divisions of the empire, had precedence of all others, and were not only often consulted on weighty affairs, but likewise enjoyed certain prerogatives peculiar to themselves.

§ 2. As to the bishop of Rome in particular, he was regarded by *Cyprian*,² and doubtless by others also, as holding a certain *primacy*

¹ Authorities are cited by David Blondel, *Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris*, p. 136, &c.—[and still more amply by James Boileau, under the fictitious name of Claudius Fontei, in his book *de Antiquo Jure Presbyterorum in Regimine Ecclesiastico*, Turin, 1676, 12mo. The most valuable of these testimonies are from the *Epistles* of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who was a warm advocate for episcopal pre-eminence, yet did not presume to determine any question of moment by his own authority, or without the advice and consent of his presbyters, and was accustomed to take the sense of the whole Church on sub-

jects of peculiar interest. See Cyprian, *Ep.* v. p. 11, ep. xiii. p. 23, ep. xxviii. p. 39, ep. xxiv. p. 33, ep. xxvii. p. 37, 38.—To the objection, that Cyprian did himself ordain some presbyters and lectors, without the consent of his council and the laity, it is answered, that the persons so advanced were *confessors*, who, according to usage, were entitled to ordination, without any previous election. Cyprian, *Ep.* xxxiv. p. 46, 47, ep. xxxv. p. 48, 49. Tertullian, *de Anima*, c. 55, p. 353, &c.—See Mosheim, *Commentt. de Reb. Christ. &c.* p. 575—579. Tr.]

² Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiii. p. 131, ep. lv. p. 86, *de Unitate Ecclesie*, p. 195, ed. Baluze.

in the church. But the fathers, who with *Cyprian* attributed this primacy to the Roman bishop, strenuously contended for the equality of all bishops in respect to dignity and authority; and disregarding the bishop of Rome's judgment, whenever they thought it incorrect, had no hesitation in following their own. Of this, *Cyprian* himself gave a striking example in his famous controversy with *Stephen*, bishop of Rome, concerning the *baptism of heretics*. Whoever shall duly consider the facts together, will readily perceive that this *primacy* was not one of *power* and authority, but only of precedence and consociation. Now the primacy of the Roman bishop in regard to the whole church, was the same as that of *Cyprian* in the African church, which did not impair at all the equality of the African bishops, or curtail their liberties and rights, but merely conferred the privilege of convoking councils, of presiding in them, and admonishing his brethren fraternally, and the like.¹

§ 3. Although the ancient mode of church government seemed in general to remain unaltered, yet there was a gradual deflexion from its rules, and an approximation towards the form of a rule by individuals. For the bishops claimed much higher authority and power than before, and gradually encroached upon the rights not only of ordinary Christians, but also of the presbyters. And to give plausibility to this, they advanced new doctrines concerning the church and the episcopal office; which, however, were so obscure for the most part, that they scarcely seem themselves to have understood them. The principal author of these innovations was *Cyprian*, than whom no one had ever contended more boldly and vehemently for episcopal power from the very beginning of Christianity. He was not, however, uniform and consistent, for in times of difficulty, when urged by necessity, he could give up his pretensions, and submit every thing to the judgment and authority of the church.²

¹ See Stephan. Baluze, *Annot. ad Cypriani, Epist.* p. 387, 389, 400, &c., and especially *Cyprian* himself, who contends strenuously for the perfect equality of all bishops. *Ep.* lxxi. p. 127. Nam nec Petrus — vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit se *primatum tenere*, et obtemperari a novellis et posteris sibi oportere. — *Ep.* lxxiii. p. 137. Unusquisque Episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem. — *Ep.* lv. ad *Cornelium Rom.* p. 86. Cum statutum — et æquum sit pariter ac justum, ut unusquisque causa illic audiat ubi est crimen admissum, et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus — [and *Cyprian's* address at the opening of the council of Carthage, A.D. 255, in his Works, p. 329, ed. Baluze. Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis *Episcopus* pro licentia libertatis et

potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi iudicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et præponendi nos in ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi. — The passages referred to in the preceding note, in which *Cyprian* not very intelligibly speaks of a unity in the church and of a certain *primacy* of the Roman pontiff, must be so understood as not to contradict these very explicit assertions of the absolute equality of all bishops. See Mosheim's *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 579—587. *Tr.*]

² [No man can speak in higher terms of the power of bishops than *Cyprian*. He inculcates, on all occasions, that bishops derive their office, not so much from their election by the clergy and people, as from the attestation and decree of God. See *Ep.* lii. p. 68, 69, *ep.* xlv. p. 59, *ep.* lv. p. 82, *ep.* lxxv. p. 113, *ep.* lxxix. p. 121. He regards bishops as the successors of the apostles.

§ 4. This change in the form of ecclesiastical government was followed by a corrupt state of the clergy. For although examples of primitive piety and virtue were not wanting, yet many were addicted to dissipation, arrogance, voluptuousness, contention, and other vices. This appears from numerous complaints, of the most credible persons in those times.¹ Many bishops now affected the privileges of princes, especially those who had charge of the more numerous and wealthy congregations; for they dazzled the eyes and minds of the populace, by a throne, attendants, and other ensigns of religious majesty, perhaps also with splendid robes. The *presbyters* imitated the example of their superiors, and, neglecting their duties, followed a luxurious way of life. This emboldened the *deacons* to make encroachments upon the rights and offices of presbyters.

§ 5. And from this cause chiefly, in my opinion, the *minor orders* of clergy, were everywhere, in this century, added to the bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The words *subdeacons*, *acolytes*, *door-keepers*, *exorcists*, and *copiate*,² designate officers, which I think the church would have never had if the rulers of it had possessed more piety or true religion. For when the honours and privileges of the bishops and presbyters were augmented, the *deacons* also became

Ep. xlii. p. 57. So that bishops are amenable to none, but to God only; while presbyters are amenable to the religious society. *Ep.* xi. p. 19. — Deacons were created by the bishop; and, therefore, can be punished by him alone, without the voice of the society. *Ep.* lxxv. p. 114. — Bishops have the same rights with apostles, whose successors they are. And hence, none but God can take cognisance of their actions. *Ep.* lxxix. p. 121. — The whole church is founded on the bishop; and no one is a true member of the church who is not submissive to his bishop. *Ep.* lxxix. p. 123. — Bishops represent Christ himself, and govern and judge in his name. *Ep.* lv. *ad Cornel.* p. 81, 82. — Hence all bishops, in the following ages, styled themselves vicars of Christ. See Bingham's *Orig. Eccles.* i. 81, &c. In the ninth century, a bishop of Paris is so styled in a letter of Servatus Lupus. *Ep.* xcix. p. 149, ed. Baluze. After the ninth century, the bishops of Rome assumed the exclusive right to this as well as other honorary episcopal titles. *Schl.* From Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* p. 588, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ Origen, *Comment. in Matthæum*, pt. i. Opp. p. 420, 441, 442. Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. 1, p. 291. Cyprian, in many of his *Epistles*.

² [Subdeacons are said by Bona to have been instituted either by Christ, as the latter schoolmen think, or by the apostles. But he admits that Scripture makes no express mention of this order, and cites no earlier authority for it than an epistle attributed to Ignatius, but generally considered spurious,

though the cardinal himself will not give it up. Subdeacons are to wait upon the deacons. The orders inferior to the subdiaconate, Bona tells us, are said by the schoolmen to be of apostolical institution, or at least have originated from those who immediately succeeded the apostles, but he admits that nothing of the sort is proved. *Acolytes* or *colets*, as they were anciently called in England, had the care of the lights, and of the wine and water for the Eucharist; *readers* are mentioned by Tertullian, and were not only to read Scripture in church, but also to bless bread and first-fruits; *exorcists* are mentioned by Tertullian, but it seems not as a particular order of ministers; when made one, they were to order non-communicants out of the church, and to pour out the water for ministration; *copiate*, otherwise called *fossarii*, or *grave-diggers*, were employed in various duties connected with funerals: the Greek form of their name seems to come from *κομιᾶν*, *to labour*, though some have derived it from *κομεῖν*, *wailing*. Bona says, that servile offices are no longer performed in the Roman church by ordained persons, but by boys and men engaged in the ordinary way. The reader who wishes for more information on these matters, cannot do better than consult Bingham, B. iii. S. — The *copiate* and *parabolani* were local fraternities, the former of Constantinople; the latter whose duty was visiting the sick, of Alexandria. Robertson, i. 280. The minor orders in the Greek church, were subdeacons, singers, readers, and door-keepers. — Gieseler, i. 268. *Ed.*]

more inflated, and refused to perform those meaner offices to which they once cheerfully submitted. The offices designated by these new titles are in great measure explained by the words themselves. The *exorcists* owed their origin to the doctrine of the New Platonists adopted by the Christians, that evil spirits have a strong desire after the human body, and that vicious men are not so much impelled to sin by their natural depravity, and the influence of bad examples, as by the suggestions of some evil spirit lodging within them.¹ The *copiate* were employed in the burial of the dead.

§ 6. Marriage was allowed to all the clergy, from the highest rank to the lowest. Yet those were accounted more holy and excellent who lived in celibacy. For it was the general persuasion, that those who lived in wedlock were much more exposed to the assaults of evil spirits than others;² and it was of immense importance that no impure or malignant spirit should assail the mind or the body of one who was to instruct and govern others. Such persons therefore, wished, if possible, to have nothing to do with conjugal life. And this many of the clergy, especially in Africa, endeavoured to accomplish with the least violence to their inclinations; for they received into their house, and even to their beds, some of those females who had vowed perpetual chastity, affirming, however, most religiously, that they had no disgraceful intercourse with them.³ These concubines were by the Greeks called *συνεῖσακτοι*, and by the Latins *mulieres subintroductæ*. Many of the bishops, indeed, sternly

¹ See J. Godofredus, *ad Codicem Theodosianum*, vi. 48. [Several of the Catholic writers, as, *e.g.* Baronius, Bellarmine, and Schelstrate, believed that these minor orders were instituted by the apostles. But the most learned writers of the Romish communion, and all the Protestants, maintain that they were first instituted in the third century. See Cardinal Bona, *Rerum Liturgicar.* l. i. c. 25, § 16, 17. Morin, *de Ordinatione*, p. iii. Exerc. 14, c. 1, and Bingham's *Orig. Eccles.* vol. i. Not one of these orders is even named by any writer who lived before Tertullian; nor are all of them named by him. Cyprian, in the middle of the third century, mentions *hypodiaconi*, *acolythi*, and *lectores*. See his *Epp.* 14, 24, 36, 42, 49, 79, ed. Baluz. And Cornelius, bp. of Rome, contemporary with Cyprian, in an epistle preserved by Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. c. 43, represents his church as embracing 46 (*πρεσβυτέρους*) presbyters; 7 (*διακόνους*) deacons; 7 (*ὑποδιακόνους*) subdeacons; 42 (*ακολούθους*) acolythi; exorcists (*ἐξορκιστὰς*), and readers (*ἀναγνώστας*), with door-keepers (*ἄμα πυλωροῖς*), together 52. — The particular functions of these inferior orders are but imperfectly defined by the writers of the third century. From the *Epistles* of Cyprian above cited, it appears that subdeacons and acolythi, singly or together,

were frequently the bearers of public letters to and from bishops; and that readers were employed to read the scriptural lessons in time of public worship. The writers and councils of the fourth century describe more fully the duties of all these petty offices. *Tr.*]

² Porphyrius, *περὶ ἀποχῆς*, lib. iv. p. 417.

³ See H. Dodwell, *Diss. tertia Cyprianica*; and Lud. Ant. Muratorius, *Diss. de Synis-actis et Agapetis*, in his *Anecdota Græca*, p. 218, Steph. Baluze, *ad Cypriani Epistol.* p. 5, 12, and others.—[This shameful practice commenced before this century. Slight allusions to it are found in the *Shepherd* of Hermas and in Tertullian; but the first distinct mention of it is in Cyprian, who inveighs severely against it in some of his *Epistles*.—It is to be remembered, that none but virgin sisters in the church, and they under a vow of perpetual chastity, became *συνεῖσακτοι*. With these some of the single clergy attempted to live, in the manner in which certain married people then lived, — dwelling and even sleeping together, but with a mutual agreement to have no conjugal intercourse. Such connexions they considered as a marriage of souls, without the marriage of bodies. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* §c. p. 599, &c. *Tr.*]

opposed this most shameful practice; but it was a long time before it could be wholly abolished.

§ 7. Of the writers of this century the most distinguished for the celebrity of his name and for the extent of his writings was *Origen*,¹ a presbyter and catechist of Alexandria, a man truly great, and the common teacher of the Christian world. Had his discernment and soundness of judgment been equal to his genius, piety, industry, erudition, and other accomplishments, he would deserve almost

¹ See P. D. Huet, *Origeniana*, a learned and valuable work; Lud. Doucin, *Histoire d'Origène et des Mouvements arrivées dans l'église au sujet de sa Doctrine*. Paris, 1700, 8vo.; and Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, iii. art. *Origène*; and many others.—[Origen, surnamed Adamantius (and *Χαλκέντερος*, from his prodigious powers and habit of sustaining labour, *S.*), was an Alexandrian Greek, born of Christian parents A.D. 185. His father Leonidas was a man of letters, a devout Christian, and took great pains with the education of his son, especially in the Holy Scriptures, some portion of which he required him daily to commit to memory. His education, begun under his father, was completed under Clemens Alexandrinus, and the philosopher Ammonius Saccas. Origen was distinguished for precocity of genius, early piety, and indefatigable industry. When his father suffered martyrdom, A.D. 202, Origen, then seventeen years old, was eager to suffer with him, but was prevented by his mother. He wrote to his father in prison, exhorting him to steadfastness in the faith, and to be unsolicitous about his family. The whole property of the family was confiscated, and Origen, with his widowed mother and six younger sons, were left in poverty. But the persecution having exterminated or driven away all the Christian schoolmasters, Origen found no difficulty in procuring a school, for which his talents so well qualified him. The next year, A.D. 203, Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, advanced him to the mastership of the catechetical school, though he was then but eighteen years old. His talents as an instructor, his eminent piety, and his assiduous attention to those who suffered in the persecution, procured him high reputation and numerous friends among the Christians; but his great success in making converts to Christianity, and forming his pupils to be intelligent and devoted Christians, rendered him odious to the pagans, who watched about his house, and hunted him through the city, in order to assassinate him. The austerity of his life was great. He fed on the coarsest fare, went barefoot, and slept on the ground. He spent the whole day in teaching, and in active duties, and devoted most of the night to his private studies and to devotion. About this time he sold his large and valu-

able collection of pagan authors, for a perpetual income of four *oboli* per diem, which he regarded as a competent support. Construing the passage in Matth. xix. 12, literally, he emasculated himself, in order to avoid temptation in his intercourse with his female pupils. About 212 he made a short visit to Rome. On his return he took his former pupil Heraclas to be his assistant in the school, so that he might devote more time to theology and the exposition of the Scriptures. Many learned persons, pagans and heretics, were converted by him; and among them, Ambrose, a Valentinian, and a man of wealth, who became a liberal patron of Origen, and at last died a martyr. In 215, the persecution under Caracalla obliged Origen to flee from Alexandria. He retired to Cæsarea in Palestine, where he was received with high respect; and though not even a deacon at that time, the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem allowed him to expound the Scriptures publicly in their presence. The next year, Demetrius called him back to Alexandria and to his mastership of the catechetical school. About this time an Arabian prince invited him to his court, to impart to him Christian instruction. Afterwards, Mammæa, the mother of the emperor Alexander Severus, sent for him to Antioch, in order to hear him preach. In 228, he was publicly called to Achaia, to withstand the heretics who disturbed the churches there. On his return through Palestine, Theoctistus, bp. of Cæsarea, and Alexander, bp. of Jerusalem, who had before treated him with marked attention, ordained him a presbyter, to the great offence of Demetrius, who was envious of the growing reputation of his catechist. Demetrius had little to object against Origen, except that he was a eunuch, and that foreign bishops had no right to ordain his laymen. Controversy ensued, and in the year 230, Demetrius assembled two councils against him, the first of which banished Origen from Alexandria, and the second deprived him of his clerical office. Demetrius also wrote letters to Rome and elsewhere, to excite odium against this unoffending man. Heraclas now succeeded him in the school at Alexandria, and Origen retired, A.D. 231, to Cæsarea in Palestine. Here he resumed his office of instructor,

unbounded commendation. As he is, all should revere his virtues and his merits. The second was *Julius Africanus*, a very learned

and continued to write expositions of the Bible. But in 235, a persecution in Palestine obliged him to flee to Cæsarea in Cappadocia, where he lived concealed for two years. After his return to Palestine, he visited Athens; and about 244, was called to attend a council at Bostra in Arabia, against Beryllus, bp. of that place, who was heretical in respect to the *personal* existence of Christ previous to his incarnation. Origen converted him to the orthodox faith. Demetrius, his persecutor, died A.D. 232, and was succeeded by Heraclas, a disciple of Origen, after whom Dionysius the Great filled the see of Alexandria from 248 to 265. The persecution of Origen died with his personal enemy Demetrius, and he was greatly beloved and honoured by all around him till the day of his death. His residence was now fixed at Cæsarea in Palestine; but he occasionally visited other places. His time was occupied in an extensive correspondence, in preaching, and in composing books explanatory of the Bible, and in defence of Christianity. Against the more learned pagans and the heretics of those times he was a champion that had no equal; he was also considered as a devout and exemplary Christian, and was, beyond question, the first biblical scholar of the age. He was master of the literature and the science of that age, which he valued only as subservient to the cause of Christ; but he was more skilful in employing them against pagans and heretics, than in the explanation and confirmation of the truths of revelation. In the latter part of his life, during the Decian persecution, A.D. 250, he was imprisoned for a considerable time, and came near to martyrdom, which he showed himself willing to meet. He was, however, released; but his sufferings in prison, added to his intense literary labours, had broken down his constitution, and he died, A.D. 254, at Tyre, in the 69th year of his age.—His winning eloquence, his great learning, his amiable temper, and his reputation for sincere and ardent piety, gave him immense influence, especially among the well informed and the higher classes in society. No man, since the apostles, had been more indefatigable, and no one had done more to diffuse knowledge and make the Christian community intelligent, united, and respectable, in the view of mankind. He was in general orthodox, according to the standard of that age; but, unfettered in his speculations, and unguarded in his communications, he threw out some crude opinions, which the next age gathered up and blazoned abroad, and

for which he was accounted by some a heretic. The principal errors ascribed to him, are derived from his four books *περὶ ἀρχῶν* (*de principiis*, on the first principles of human knowledge), and are: 1. The pre-existence of human souls, and their incarceration in material bodies, for offences committed in a former state of being. 2. The pre-existence of Christ's human soul, and its union with the divine nature anterior to the incarnation of Christ. 3. The transformation of our material bodies into ethereal ones, at the resurrection. 4. The final recovery of all men, and even devils, through the mediation of Christ.—Origen could number among his pupils many eminent martyrs and divines, among whom Firmilianus of Cappadocia, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Dionysius the Great, bp. of Alexandria, are best known at the present day.—His life and history are best related by Eusebius, *H. E.* vi.; and by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* cap. 55, and *Ep.* 41 or 65. The united work of Pamphilus and Eusebius, in defence of Origen, in six books, is unfortunately lost, except the first book, of which we have a translation by Rufinus. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 64, gives a philippic upon Origen and his followers. Photius, *Biblioth.* cxviii. affords us some knowledge of his lost works.—Origen was a most voluminous writer. Eusebius says he collected 100 Epistles of Origen, and that when sixty years old, Origen permitted stenographers to write down his extempore discourses.—Besides these, he composed eight *Books against Celsus*, in defence of Christianity, which are still extant; four *Books περὶ ἀρχῶν*, extant in a Latin translation by Rufinus; ten books entitled *Stromata*, which are lost; his *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*, of which little remains; and tracts on prayer, martyrdom, and the resurrection. But his principal works are expositions of the Scriptures. It is said, he wrote on every book in the Bible, except the Apocalypse. His allegorical mode of interpreting Scripture is described by Mosheim in the next chapter. Origen's expositions are of three kinds:—1. *Homilies*, or popular lectures. 2. *Commentaries*, divided into books, which are full, elaborate, and learned expositions. 3. *Scholia*, or short notes, intended especially for the learned. A collection of Origen's *Scholia*, and scattered remarks on Scripture, compiled by Basil the Great and Gregory Nazianzen, is extant, bearing the title of *Φιλοκαλία*. A large part of his Homilies and Commentaries is wholly lost, and some of the others have come to us only in the Latin translation of

man, most of whose labours and works are lost.¹ The name of *Hippolytus* ranks very high among both the writers and the martyrs; but his history is involved in much obscurity.² The writings now extant bearing the name of this great man are, not without

Rufinus.—The earlier editions of Origen's works are chiefly in Latin, and of little value. P. D. Huet, a Benedictine monk, first published, A.D. 1668, in 2 vols. fol. the expository works of Origen, Greek and Latin, with notes, and a valuable introduction entitled *Origeniana*. Bern. de Montfaucon, another Benedictine, collected and published what remains of his *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*, Paris, 1714, 2 vols. fol. But the best edition of all his works, except the *Hexapla*, is that of the Benedictines Charles, and Charles Vincent de la Rue, Paris, 1733—59, 4 vols. fol. The text of this edition, Greek and Latin, without the notes and dissertations, was re-published by Oberthür, Würzburg, 1780—93, 15 vols. 8vo. The principal modern writers concerning Origen, besides Huet and the De la Rues, are Tillemont, *Mém. &c.*, iii. 216—264. Bayle, *Dict. art.* *Origène*, Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 112, &c. Lardner, *Credibility*, pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 161, &c. Haloix, *Defence of Origen*. Doucin, *Histoire d'Origène*, Paris, 1700, 8vo. Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* p. 605—680. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* iv. 29—145. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. 1172—1214. Milner's account of Origen, *Ecol. Hist.* cent. iii. ch. 5, 6, 15, is not impartial. *Tr.* The work entitled *Origenis Philosophumena*, published at Oxford, 1851, ed. E. Miller, is now shown to belong to Hippolytus. See note ² below. *Ed.*]

¹ [Julius Africanus, for erudition, and as an interpreter of Scripture, is ranked with Clemens Alex. and Origen by Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 35. The best account of this distinguished man is derived from Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 31, and Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 63. He was probably of Nicopolis, once called Emmaus, in Judea, and is supposed to have died, being a man in years, about A.D. 232. Of his life little is known, except that he once visited Alexandria, to confer with Heraclas, head of the catechetical school after Origen; and that, the city of Nicopolis having been burnt, about A.D. 221, Africanus was sent as envoy to the emperor, with a petition that it might be rebuilt. His principal work was *Annals of the World, from the Creation down to A.D. 221*, in five books. This work, of which only fragments now remain, was highly esteemed by the ancients, and was the basis of many similar works, namely,—The *Chronicons* of Eusebius, Syncellus, Malala, Theophanes, Cedrenus, and others. He was author of *A letter to Aristides*, reconciling the two

genealogies of our Saviour. Of this work we have a long extract in Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 7, and a Fragment in Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacre*, ii. 115. Africanus supposed Matthew to give the *true* descent of Joseph from David by Solomon, and Luke to give his *legal* descent from the same by Nathan, according to the *law* for raising up seed to a deceased brother. Jacob and Heli, the two reputed fathers of Joseph, he supposed, were *half-brothers*, having the same mother, but different fathers; and Heli dying childless, Jacob married his widow, and begat Joseph, whom the law accounted as the son of the deceased Heli. Another letter of Africanus, addressed to Origen, is still extant in the works of Origen, vol. i. p. 10—12, ed. De la Rue. The object of this letter is, to prove the history of Susanna spurious, and the work of some person much younger than Daniel. His chief argument is, that the writer makes Daniel play upon the Greek words *σχιῶς* and *πρίως*, in verses 54, 55, 58, 59, while examining the witnesses against Susanna. Eusebius and others ascribe to Africanus another and larger work, entitled *Keσoλ*. It is a miscellany, and unworthy of a Christian divine. Valesius thinks Eusebius mistook, attributing the work of some pagan bearing the same name, to this Christian father. Others suppose it might have been written by Africanus, in his youth or before his conversion. Many fragments of it have been collected by Thevenot, and published in his *Collection of the Writings of the ancient Greek Mathematicians*, Paris, 1693, fol. *Tr.*]

² The Benedictine monks have, with great labour and erudition, endeavoured to dispel this darkness. See *Histoire Littér. de la France*, i. 361, &c. Paris, 1733, 4to. [Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, near Rome, was a disciple of Irenæus, and flourished A.D. 190—235. He was martyred in 235, being bound hand and foot, and thrown into a pit full of water. His statue was discovered in the Via Tiburtina in 1551. *Ed.*] Eusebius, vi. 20, gives this account of his writings: 'Besides many other works, he wrote a treatise concerning Easter, in which he describes the succession of events, and proposes a Paschal Cycle of 16 years; the work terminates with the first year of the emperor Alexander.' (Severus, A.D. 222.) 'His other writings which have reached me are these, on the *Hexaëmeron*' (Gen. i.); 'on what follows the *Hexaëmeron*; against Marcion; on the *Canticles*; on parts of Ezekiel; concerning

reason, regarded by many as either entirely spurious, or at least corrupted. Gregory, bishop of New Cæsarea,¹ was surnamed *Thaumaturgus*, on account of the numerous and distinguished miracles which he is said to have wrought. But few of his writings are now extant; his miracles are questioned by many at the present day.² I

Easter; against all the heresies.' Besides these, Jerome, *de Vir. Ill.* c. 61, mentions his Commentaries on Exodus, Zechariah, the Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel, the Apocalypse, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes; and tracts concerning Saul and the witch, Anti-christ, the resurrection; his discourse in praise of our Lord and Saviour. Other works are enumerated on the base of his statue; also by Photius, *Biblioth.* No. 121 and 122; and Ebed-jesus, in Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* tom. iii. pt. i. His Paschal Cycle is his only work that has come down to us entire. His known works were edited by Fabricius, in two thin volumes, fol. Hamb. 1716—18.—For a more full account of him and his writings, besides the *Histoire Litt. de la France*, and Fabricius, *ad Hippol. Opera*, see Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iii. 104 and 309, &c. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 102, &c. Lardner, *Credib.* pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 69, &c. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* iv. 154, &c. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. 1147, &c. *Tr.* He appears to have written two works against heresies, the smaller one of which was known to Photius, and of which a fragment remains; the larger, containing a view of ancient philosophy, and a treatise on all the heresies, the first book of which is printed among the works of Origen; the second and third are lost. Part of the fourth, and the remaining five were found in a MS. at Mt. Athos in 1842, and published at Oxford in 1851, as Origen's *Philosophumena*. This mistake was almost immediately discovered, and the book proved to belong to Hippolytus. It is of great value, as showing the state of the Roman Church in the third century. Consult, on the whole subject, *S. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome*, by Dr. Chr. Wordsworth, London, 1853. The book of Hippolytus against heresies was also published at Göttingen in 1859, by Professors Schneidewin and Duncker. *Ed.*]

¹ [In Pontus. *Tr.*]

² See Anton. van Dale, Preface to his book *de Oraculis*, p. 6. [Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* ii. 351, &c. and p. 380—392, and Lardner, *Credibility*, pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 450, &c. Gregory of New Cæsarea in Pontus, whose original name was Theodorus, was born of heathen parents at New Cæsarea near the beginning of this century. His family was wealthy and respectable. After the death of his father, which was when he was fourteen years old, his mother and the children became nominally Christians. But Gregory was a stranger to the Bible, and ambitious

to make a figure in the world. About 231, he left Pontus, intending to study law in the famous law school at Berytus, but meeting with Origen at Cæsarea, he was induced to change his purpose. He applied himself to the study of the Bible, was baptized, assumed the name of Gregory, and continued under the instruction of Origen eight years, except that he fled to Alexandria for a short time to avoid persecution. He was now a devoted Christian, and a man of great promise. On leaving Origen, he composed and read in a public assembly an eulogy on his instructor, in which he gives account of his own past life, and of the manner in which Origen had allured him to the study of the Scriptures, and changed all his views. Taking an affectionate leave of his master, he returned to Pontus, and became bishop of his native city, New Cæsarea, where he spent the remainder of his life. He was a laborious and successful pastor, and highly respected for his talents and piety, as well as for numerous miracles which he is said to have wrought. When created bishop, he found but seventeen Christians in his very populous diocese. When he died, there was only about the same number of pagans in it. He and his flock endured persecution in 250. He attended the first council of Antioch, against Paul of Samosata, in 264 or 265, and died soon after.—Some account of him is given by Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 30, and vii. 14, 28. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 65, and *Ep. ad Magnum*. But his great eulogists, among the ancients, were the two brothers, Basil the Great, and Gregory Nyssen, whose grandmother heard the ministry of Greg. Thaum. and furnished her grandchildren with an account of him. Basil speaks of him in his *Book on the Holy Spirit*, and in his *Epistles*, No. 28, 110, 204, 207, or 62, 63, 64, 75; and Nyssen, in his *Life of Gregory Thaum.* inter Opp. Gregorii Nys. iii. 536, &c. Among the moderns who give us his history, and enumerate his works, see Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iv. 131, &c. and *Notes sur S. Grég. Thaum.* p. 47. Du Pin, *Nov. Biblioth. des Aut. Ecclès.* i. 184, &c. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* v. 247, &c. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. 12—24, &c. Schroeckh, *ubi supra*. Lard. *ubi supra*, and Milner, *Eccles. Hist.*, cent. iii. ch. 18.—The only genuine works of Gregory that are extant, are his Eulogy on Origen, which has been mentioned; a Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes; a short Confession of Faith (the

could wish that many writings of *Dionysius*, bishop of Alexandria were now extant; for the few fragments which have reached us show that he was a man of distinguished wisdom and mildness of disposition, and prove that the ancients used no flattery when they styled him *Dionysius the Great*.¹ *Methodius* was a man of piety, and had

last part of which some have questioned); and a Letter, containing counsel for the treatment of the lapsed. The spurious works attributed to him are, *Capita xii. de Fide*, with anathemas;—in *Annuntiationem Sanctissimæ Mariæ Sermones tres*; in *Sancta Theophania*, sive de apparitione Dei, et Christi Baptismo, Sermo; *de Anima disputatio* Tatianum; *Expositio Fidei, ἡ κατὰ μέγος πίστις*, (relating only to the Trinity).—All these were collected and published, with learned notes, by Gerard Vossius, Mayence, 1604, 4to, and Paris, 1622, fol. with the works of Macarius, Basil of Seleucia, and a tract of Zonaras subjoined. 7v.]

¹ The history of Dionysius is carefully written by Ja. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, i. l. ii. c. 5, p. 68.—[He was probably born of heathen parents, but early converted by Origen, under whom he had his education at Alexandria. He became a presbyter there; and succeeded Heraclas as head of the catechetical school, about 232; and in 248 in the episcopal chair, which he filled till his death. We know little of his history while a catechist, except that he now read carefully all the works of heretics and pagans, and made himself master of the controversies of the day. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 7.) As a bishop, he was uncommonly laborious and faithful. He lived in stormy times, was called to almost continual contests with errorists, and had little rest from persecution, in which he and his flock suffered exceedingly. These sufferings are described in the copious extracts from his writings, preserved by Eusebius, *E. H.* book vi. and vii. In 249, the pagans of Alexandria rose against the Christians, murdered several, assaulted and plundered, and drove into hiding-places most of the rest. The next year the general persecution under Decius commenced, and Dionysius was under arrest, and suffered much with his flock for a year and a half. Soon after his release, the pestilence began to lay waste the church and the city, and did not entirely cease till the end of twelve years. About the same time, Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, embraced and disseminated millennarian principles; but was at length reclaimed by Dionysius. The warm contest respecting the baptism of converted heretics, about 256, was submitted, by both parties, to him, and drew forth several able productions from his pen. Not long after, he had to withstand the Sabellians

in a long and arduous controversy. In 257, the persecution under Valerian commenced; and for about two years, Dionysius was in banishment, transported from place to place, and subjected to great sufferings. After his return, in 260, insurrection among the pagans, and civil war and famine raged at Alexandria. Scarcely was quiet restored, when this aged and faithful servant of God was solicited to aid in the controversy against Paul of Samosata. His infirmities prevented his attending the council of Antioch in 265, where Paul was condemned; but he wrote his judgment of the controversy, sent it to the council, and died soon after in the close of that year. In his controversy with the Sabellians, he was unfortunate. For in his zeal to maintain a *personal distinction* between the Father and the Son, he let drop expressions which seemed to imply, that the latter was of another and an inferior nature to the former. This led the Sabellians to accuse him of heresy; and a council assembled at Rome, called on him to explain his views. He replied in several books or letters, addressed to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, which pretty well satisfied his contemporaries. Afterwards, when the Arians claimed him, Athanasius came forth in vindication of his orthodoxy. Mosheim (*de Rebus Christianor.* p. 696, &c.) supposed that Dionysius differed from the orthodox on the one hand, and from Sabellius on the other, in the following manner: They all agreed, that in Jesus Christ *two natures*, the human and the divine, were united. The orthodox maintained, that *both* natures constituted but *one person*, and denied personality to the human nature. Sabellius admitted the union of two natures in Christ, but denied personality to his *divine* nature. Dionysius distinguished *two persons*, as well as two natures, in Christ; and affirmed that the actions and sufferings of the human nature could not be predicated of the divine nature. Natalis Alexander has a Dissertation (*Hist. Eccles. sæcul. iii. diss. xix.*) in vindication of the orthodoxy, though not of all the phraseology of Dionysius. For a knowledge of the life and writings of Dionysius, the chief original sources are, Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 29, 35, 40—42, 44—46; vii. 1, 4—11, 20—28. *Præpar. Evang.* xiv. 23—27. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 69, and *Præfatio ad Lib.* 18. *Comment. in Esaiam*. Athanasius, *de Sententia Dionysii*; and *de Synod. Nicænæ*

some weight of character; but the few works of his remaining, prove him to have been deficient in accuracy of discrimination.¹

§ 8. Of the Latin writers of this century *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, deservedly stands first. The epistles and tracts of this distinguished and eloquent man, breathe such a spirit of ardent piety, that scarcely any one can read them without feeling his soul stirred

Decretis; Basil, *de Spiritu Sancto*, c. 29; *Epist. ad Amphilocho*, and *Epist. ad Maximum*. Of his works, only two short compositions have come to us entire; namely, his very sensible letter to Novatian (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 45), and his *Epistola Canonica ad Basilidem*, in which he gives his opinion respecting the proper hour for terminating the fast before Easter, and the obligation of Christians to observe certain Jewish laws respecting personal uncleannesses. But we have valuable extracts from many of his letters and books. Eusebius gives portions of the following: namely, his Epistle to Germanus, giving account of his flight and sufferings in the Decian persecution (*H. E.* vi. 40, and vii. 11).—Ep. to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, describing the sufferings of his flock in the same persecution (*H. E.* vi. 40—42, 44).—Ep. to Hermammon, on the character of the emperors Decius and Valerian (*H. E.* vii. 1, 10, 23).—Ep. to Stephen, bishop of Rome, on the peace after the persecution of Gallus (*H. E.* vii. 4, 5).—Ep. to Domitius and Didymus, describing the Decian persecution at Alexandria (*H. E.* vii. 11).—Ep. to Hierax, describing the sedition at Alexandria (*H. E.* vii. 21).—Ep. to Sixtus, bishop of Rome, on rebaptism of heretics, and on the Sabellians (*H. E.* vii. 5, 6).—Another Ep. to the same, on rebaptism, &c. (*H. E.* vii. 9).—Ep. to Philemon, a Roman presbyter, on the same subject (*H. E.* vii. 7).—Ep. to Dionysius, then a presbyter at Rome, on the same subject, and concerning Novatian (*H. E.* vii. 7, 8).—Two books against Nepos and the Millenarians, on the promises to the saints in the Apocalypse, the nature of that book, and its author (*H. E.* vii. 24, 25).—Ep. to his own flock, after the plague, consolatory (*H. E.* vii. 22).—*Libri* iv. *de Natura*, against Epicurean doctrines, dedicated to his son (Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* xiv. 23—27). Athanasius also gives extracts from various of his works. Eusebius mentions several works of Dionysius, from which he gives no extracts (*H. E.* vi. 46, and vii. 26): namely, epistles to the brethren in Egypt, *de Pœnitentia*—to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, *de Pœnitentia*—to his own church, a monitory epistle—to Origen, on martyrdom—to the brethren of Laodicea—to the brethren in Armenia—to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, concerning Novatian—to the brethren at Rome, three epistles concerning the office of a deacon,

concerning peace, and *de Pœnitentia*—to the confessors at Rome, who favoured Novatian—to the same, after they returned to the church, two letters—to Sixtus and the church at Rome, on rebaptism, &c.—to Dionysius of Rome, concerning Lucian—and various Paschal Epistles (a species of pastoral letters) addressed to Flavius—to Domitian and Didymus—to his own presbyters—to his flock, after the persecution of Valerian—to the brethren in Egypt, &c. *Tr.*—Cf. Neale's *Hist. Patriarchate of Alexandria*, i. 39—75. London, 1847. *Ed.*]

¹ [Methodius Patarensis Eubulius was bishop of Olympos or of Patara, in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre. He lived during the last half of the third century, and died a martyr, at Chalcis in Greece, probably A. D. 311, during the Diocletian persecution. Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* c. 83) ranks him among the popular writers, and commends him especially for the neatness of his style; but Socrates (in his *H. E.* vi. 13) represents him as one of those low and contemptible scribblers, who endeavour to bring themselves into notice by assailing the characters of their superiors. His works, as enumerated by Jerome, are (1) Two books *against Porphyry* (a large work now lost).—(2) *Feast of the ten Virgins* (a dialogue of pious females in praise of celibacy: it is still extant, though perhaps corrupted, but does its author little credit).—(3) *On the resurrection of the body*, against Origen, *opus egregium*. (It is but an indifferent work; much of it is preserved by Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxiv. Photius, *Biblioth.* cccxxiv. &c).—(4) *On the witch of Endor*, against Origen (not extant).—(5) *On free will* (and the origin of evil; not from matter, but from abuse of human liberty. Extracts from it remain).—(6) *Commentaries on Genesis and Canticles* (almost wholly lost).—(7) Many other popular works (not described by Jerome).—The works of Methodius, so far as they remain, were edited, with those of Amphilochius and Andreas Cretensis, by Francis Combefis, Paris, 1644, fol. But the *Feast of the Virgins* first appeared in the original Greek, in Combefis, *Auctuar. noviss. Biblioth. PP. Græc.* p. i.—Several discourses of the younger Methodius, patriarch of Constantinople in the 9th century, have been ascribed to the senior Methodius. *Tr.*]

within him. Yet *Cyprian* would doubtless have been a better writer, if he had been less studious of rhetorical ornaments, and a better bishop, if he had been more capable of controlling his temper, and of discriminating between truth and error.¹ The *Dialogue of*

¹ [Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus was born of heathen parents, and probably about 200, at Carthage, in Africa. He was rather dissipated, but was a man of genius, and a teacher of rhetoric. In 244 or 245 he was converted to Christianity, by Cæcilius, a presbyter of Carthage, whose name he assumed. An account of his conversion we have in his tract, *de Gratia Dei, ad Donatum*. As soon as he became a Christian, he distributed all his property in charity to the poor, devoted himself much to the study of the Bible, and of his favourite author Tertullian, and showed a zeal and earnestness in religion seldom equalled. He was made a presbyter a few months after his conversion, and was advanced to the episcopal chair in 248. As a bishop he was indefatigable and efficient. Few men ever accomplished so much in a long life, as Cyprian did in the ten years of his episcopacy. In 250 the Decian persecution obliged him to leave Carthage and live in concealment for more than a year. During his exile he wrote thirty-nine epistles, which are extant, addressed to his church, to its officers collectively or individually, to other bishops, and to various individuals. On his return to Carthage, A.D. 251, he had much to do to collect and regulate his flock: a controversy arose respecting the reception of the lapsed to Christian fellowship: and Cyprian had personal contests with some of his presbyters, who were opposed to him. He was also drawn into the Novatian controversy. The persecution was soon after renewed by the emperor Gallus; and pestilence and famine spread wide; and incursions of barbarians from the desert laid waste the back country. Cyprian wrote and preached incessantly; and in 253, called a council and roused up the African churches to great efforts for redeeming Christian captives. For several years he was most laboriously employed in preaching, composing tracts, and directing the ecclesiastical affairs, not only of Carthage and Africa, but also of other countries. In 257, the persecution under Valerian broke out, and Cyprian was banished to Curubis. The persecution was severe in Africa: many were imprisoned, condemned to the mines, or put to death. Cyprian gave what aid he could to his suffering brethren. The next year, A.D. 258, he was recalled from banishment, summoned before the new governor, Galerius, and condemned to be beheaded.—Cyprian lived but twelve years after he embraced

Christianity; and during ten of these he was incessantly engaged in active duties. It was impossible, therefore, that he should become a very learned theologian. Though a man of genius, he was not a metaphysician or philosopher, and seems not to have been formed for abstruse speculations. He was an orator and a man of business rather than a profound scholar. The practical part of Christianity, and the order and discipline of the church, most engaged his attention. Naturally ardent, and poring daily over the writings of Tertullian, he imbibed very much the spirit and the principles of that gloomy Montanist: and having high ideas of episcopal power, and great intrepidity of character, he was an energetic prelate, and a severe disciplinarian.—The best original sources for the history of this distinguished man, are his own numerous letters and tracts, and the *Passio S. Cypriani*, or account of his martyrdom, written by Pontius, one of his deacons. He is very honourably mentioned by many of the fathers; and Gregory Naz. wrote a professed eulogy of him. The moderns also, especially the Roman Catholics and the English Episcopalians, have written elaborately concerning his history, his works, and his opinions. See Bp. Pearson's *Annales Cyprianici*, and H. Dodwell's *Dissertationes Cyprianicæ*, in the Oxford edition of Cyprian's works, 1682; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iv. 19, &c., and *Notes sur S. Cyprien*, p. 10, &c. Prud. Maran, *Vita S. Cypriani*, prefixed to Opp. Cyp. ed. Paris, 1726, p. 38—134; and J. Milner's *Church Hist.* cent. iii. ch. 7—15. His works consist of eighty-one Epistles, and forty-one Treatises, which are accounted genuine. They are nearly all practical, — hortatory, controversial, and official or friendly letters.—His style is neither perspicuous nor chaste, but ardent and animated. He and Lactantius, it has been said, were the fathers of ecclesiastical Latinity.—The earlier editions of his works, by Erasmus and others, arranged his letters in books, without regard to their dates or subjects. The edition of Pamelius, 1566, republished by Rigaltius, 1664, attempted to arrange them in chronological order. The Oxford edition by Bishop Fell, 1682, fol. perfected this arrangement. The edition prepared by Baluze, and published by Prudentius Maran, Paris, 1726, fol. retains the order of Pamelius. The two last are the best editions. Tr.—Translated in the *Library of the Fathers*, Oxford, vol. 3 and 17. *Ed.*]

Minucius Felix, which he entitled *Octavius*, answers the arguments by which the Christians were commonly attacked by their adversaries, in a manner so skilful and spirited, that it cannot be disregarded by any who would not be ignorant of the state of the church in this century.¹ The seven books of *Arnobius*, the African, *against the Gentiles*, are more full and copious, and though obscure in several places, will not be read without both pleasure and profit. Yet this rhetorician, who was superficial in his knowledge of Christian doctrines, has commingled great errors with important truths, and has set forth a strange philosophical kind of religion, very different from that ordinarily received.² The writers of less eminence, I leave to be learned from those who have professedly enumerated the learned men among Christians.³

¹ [Minucius Felix was a respectable Christian lawyer at Rome, and is supposed to have been contemporary with Tertullian, and to have flourished about 220. He is mentioned by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 58, and by Lactantius, *Institut. Divinar.* l. i. c. 11, and l. v. c. 1. Little is known of his history. His elegant Dialogue between Cæcilius a pagan and Octavius a Christian, recounts the principal arguments urged for and against Christianity at that time, in a clear, concise, and forcible manner. The Latinity is pure and elegant. Jerome informs us that another tract, *de Fato vel contra Mathematicos*, was ascribed to him; but from its style, it was probably not his. This tract is now lost. In the middle ages, the *Octavius* of Minucius was mistaken for the eighth Book (*Liber Octavus*) of Arnobius: and it was so published in the earlier editions. It has been often republished. The best editions, cum notis variorum, are those of Gronovius, Leyden, 1709, 8vo.; and of Davis, Cambridge, 1707 and 1711, 8vo. The Germans are fond of the edition of Cellarius, 1698, 8vo, republished by Linder, 1760, and by Ernesti, 1773, 8vo. It has been translated into French, Dutch, and English; the last, by Reeves, among his *Apologies in Defence of the Christian Religion*, vol. ii. Lond. 1709, 8vo. Tr.]

² [Arnobius, senior, was a teacher of rhetoric at Sicca, in Africa, during the reign of Diocletian. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 79. He was at first an open adversary of the Christian religion, but at length, being fully convinced of its truth, he undertook to defend it in a learned and elaborate work. But either his knowledge of Christianity was then very limited, or he had studied the Scriptures only in private, and without seeking instruction from the Christian teachers, for he entertained many singular opinions. Jerome reports (*Chron. ad ann. xx. Constantini*), that when Arnobius applied to the bishop for baptism, the latter refused him, from doubts of the sincerity of his

conversion; and that Arnobius wrote his book to satisfy the mind of the bishop. This account is called in question by some. See Lardner, *Credibility*, &c. pt. ii. vol. iv. p. 7, and Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. 1161, &c. He probably wrote in the beginning of the fourth century, and died perhaps about A.D. 326. The best early editions of his work, are those printed at Leyden, 1651 and 1657, 4to. The latest edition is that of Orell, Lips. 1816, 8vo, in two parts, with an Appendix, 1817, 8vo. Tr.]

³ [The following notices of other leading men in this century, may be interesting to the literary reader.

Caius, a learned ecclesiastic of Rome, in the beginning of this century, is mentioned by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 59, and is quoted repeatedly by Eusebius. In his work against Proculus the Montanist, he assailed the Chiliasts, and ascribed but thirteen epistles to St. Paul. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 25, iii. 28, and vi. 20. He has been supposed by some to be the author of the book against Artemon, quoted by Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28.

Just before A.D. 200, Theophilus, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, Bacchyllus bishop of Corinth, and Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, called councils on the controversy respecting Easter-day, and composed synodic Epistles. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 43—45, and Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23 and 25. From the epistle of Polycrates, valuable extracts are made by Jerome, l. c. and Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 31, and v. 24.

At the commencement of this century, lived Heraclitus, Maximus, Candidus, Ap-pion, Sextus, and Arabianus, who were distinguished as writers, according to Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 46—51, and Euseb. *H. E.* v. 27. — Heraclitus commented on Paul's Epistles; Maximus wrote concerning the origin of evil (*περί της ὕλης*, from which we have a considerable extract, in Euseb. *Præpar. Evang.* vii. 22). Candidus and Ap-pion explained the Hexæmeron, or six days' work, *Gen.* ch. i.; Sextus wrote on the

resurrection; and Arabianus composed some doctrinal tracts.

Judas, of the same age, undertook a computation of the seventy weeks of Daniel; and brought down his history of events to A.D. 203. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 52, and Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 7.

Ammonius was probably an Egyptian Christian, nearly contemporary with Origen; and not the apostate philosopher Ammonius Saccas, under whom Origen studied, though confounded with him by Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19, and by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 55. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* iv. p. 161 and 172, and Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* p. 281, &c. He wrote a book on the agreement of Moses with Jesus, which is lost, and a *Harmony of the four Gospels*, which is supposed to be one of those still extant in the *Biblioth. Max. Patrum*. But whether the larger *Harmony*, in tom. ii. pt. ii. or the smaller, in tom. iii. is the genuine work, has been doubted. See Lardner, *Credibility*, &c. pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 106, &c.

Tryphon, a disciple of Origen, is said by Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* c. 57) to have been very learned in the Scriptures, and to have written many epistles and tracts, and particularly a treatise concerning the red heifer, in the book of Num. ch. xix; and another on the dividing of the birds in Abraham's sacrifice, Gen. xv. 10. Nothing of his is extant.

Symmachus, originally a Samaritan, then a Jew, and at last an Ebionite Christian, gave a free translation of the O. T. into Greek; and also defended the principles of the Ebionites, in a Commentary on Matthew's Gospel. See Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 17.

Narcissus was made bishop of Jerusalem A.D. 196. After four years of faithful service, he was falsely accused of immoral conduct; and, though generally accounted innocent, he voluntarily abdicated his office, and lived in retirement till A.D. 216, when he resumed his office, and continued in it till his martyrdom, A.D. 237. He was then 116 years old. See Euseb. *H. E.* vi. c. 9, 10, 11.

Alexander succeeded Narcissus A.D. 237, and held the chair fourteen years. This eminent man was bishop of a church in Cappadocia, when called to the see of Jerusalem. He was a great patron of Origen; and wrote several epistles, from which extracts are preserved. After important services to the church, he died a martyr, A.D. 251. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 62, and Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 11, 14, 19, 26, 39, and 46.

Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, was a great admirer and a disciple of Origen. He was a man of high eminence in the church, and died at Tarsus, on his way to the second council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, about A.D. 266. A long

and able epistle of his to Cyprian, on the rebaptism of heretics, is preserved in a Latin translation among the works of Cyprian, *Ep.* 75. See Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26, 27, 46; and vii. 5, 29.

Pontius, a deacon of Carthage, attended Cyprian at his death, and wrote an account of his martyrdom, which has reached us, though perhaps interpolated. It is prefixed to Cyprian's works, and is found in Ruinart, *Acta Selecta Martyrum*. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 68. Pontius himself, it is said, suffered martyrdom shortly after; of which an account is extant, professedly written by his fellow-deacon Valerius; *apud Baluzii Miscell.* ii. 124.

Cornelius, bishop of Rome, was elected June 2, A.D. 251, in opposition to Novatian; and, after fifteen months, died in banishment at Centumcellæ (Civita'-Vecchia), September 14, A.D. 252. In the works of Cyprian, there are extant two epistles of Cornelius to Cyprian, and ten epistles of Cyprian to Cornelius. Cyprian describes him (*Ep.* 52, ed. Baluz.) as an unimpeachable character—a pious, sensible, modest man—well qualified to be a bishop. Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* c. 66) mentions four epistles of Cornelius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch; and Eusebius gives us a long and valuable extract from one of them. *H. E.* vi. 43. See Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i.

Novatian, first a presbyter, and then the schismatical bishop of Rome, wrote (according to Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 70) *de Pascha*; *de Sabbato*; *de Circumcisione*; *de Sacerdote*; *de Oratione*; *de Cibis Judaicis* (extant, inter Opp. Tertulliani); *de Instantia*; *de Attalo*; *de Trinitate* (a large book, being an abridgment of a work of Tertullian, extant, inter Opp. Tertull.); and many other works. An epistle written by him to Cyprian, in the name of the Roman clergy, A.D. 250, is likewise extant (inter Opp. Cypriani, ep. 31, ed. Baluz.), and shows that he was a man of talents, and a good writer. His rival, Cornelius, describes him as a very bad man. See Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 43.

Stephen, bishop of Rome, A.D. 253—257, is chiefly famous for his presumptuous attempt to excommunicate Cyprian and many other bishops of Africa and the East, for rebaptizing converted heretics. See Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 2—5, 7. Cyprian, *Ep.* 70—75. Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i.

Sixtus II. bishop of Rome, A.D. 257, 258, and a martyr, was more conciliatory than his predecessor. Euseb. vii. 5, 9. Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. Various supposititious writings are extant under his name. The most noted is a series of 460 moral Apophthegms, translated by Rufinus. Jerome (on Ezek. c. xviii. and elsewhere), and Augustine (*Retract.* l. ii. c. 42), pronounce them the work of Sixtus, a pagan philoso-

pher; which they probably are, notwithstanding U. G. Sieber, their editor (Lips. 1725, 4to), has laboured hard to fix them on this Roman bishop.

Dionysius, bishop of Rome, A. D. 259—269, was a learned man, and a good bishop. See Basil, *Ep.* 220, and *de Sp. Sancto*, c. 29. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 7. He wrote an epistle against the Sabellians, of which Athanasius (*de Synodi Nicænæ decretis*) has preserved an extract; also an epistle to Dionysius of Alexandria, acquainting him with the dissatisfaction of a council of bishops at Rome, with some expressions concerning the Trinity used by that patriarch, and requesting of him an explanation, which was given in four Letters or Books. Athanasius, *pro Sententia Dionys. Alex.*, and Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 26. See Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i.

Malchion, a presbyter, and a teacher of philosophy at Antioch. He greatly distinguished himself in the third council, against Paul of Samosata, A. D. 269. Two previous councils had been unable to convict the crafty heretic; but in this, Malchion encountered him in presence of the council, while reporters took down their dialogue. Paul was now convicted; and the Dialogue was published. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 29. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 71.

Commodianus, a Christian poet, was probably an African and contemporary, or nearly so, with Cyprian. See Dodwell's *Diss. de Ætate Commodiani*. He had a smattering of Greek and Latin learning, but was a weak though well-meaning man. His book comprises eighty paragraphs, called *Instructions*. It is written acrostically, and in a loose kind of hexameter: the style is rude, and the matter trite; the first half of the book is directed against the pagans; next he assails the unbelieving Jews; and then attempts to instruct all classes of Christians, and all ranks of ecclesiastical functionaries. It was first published by Rigaltius, subjoined to Cyprian's works, A. D. 1650; and again in 1666. The editions, with notes, by Schurtzfleisch, 1710, and of Davis, subjoined to his *Minucius Felix*, Camb. 1711, 8vo. are the best. [A long poem by Commodianus is printed in the *Spicilegium Solesmense*, vol. i. Paris, 1852. *Ed.*]

Anatolius, a very scientific ecclesiastic of Alexandria, who, by his address, once delivered his townsmen from a siege. He was made bishop of Laodicea in Syria, about A. D. 270, and published canons for ascertaining Easter, from which Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 32) has preserved an extract; and Institutes of arithmetic, in ten books, of which some fragments still remain. Eusebius (l. c.) gives a long account of him. See also Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 73.

What remains of his works has been published, Greek and Latin, by Bucherius, in his *Doctrina Temporum* Antw. 1634, fol.

Archelaus, bishop of Caschara, in Mesopotamia, flourished about A. D. 278. He wrote in Syriac his disputation with Manes the heretic; which was early translated into Greek, and thence into Latin. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 72. A large part of the Latin copy was first published by Valesius, subjoined to Socrates, *H. E.*; afterwards, together with what remains of the Greek, by Zaccagnius, in his *Collection of rare Works of the Greek and Latin Church*, Rome, 1698, 4to, p. 1—102; and lastly, by Fabricius, ad finem *Opp. S. Hippolyti*, 2 vols. fol.

Pierius, a presbyter, and perhaps catechist of Alexandria. He was of Origen's school, very learned in the Scriptures, and wrote many discourses and expositions in a neat and simple style. He was called Origen Junior. His long discourse on the prophet Hosea is particularly noticed by Jerome. Photius (*Biblioth.* cxix.) mentions twelve books of his expositions. He was of an ascetic turn, lived considerably into the fourth century, and spent his latter years at Rome. Nothing of his remains. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 76; and Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32.

Theognostus, of Alexandria, a friend of Origen, and perhaps successor to Pierius in the catechetic school. He wrote seven books of Hypotyposes; of which Photius (*Biblioth.* cvi.) has preserved an abstract. Photius deemed him heretical, in regard to the Trinity; but Athanasius makes quotations from him, in confutation of the Arians. See Fabricius, *Biblioth.* Gr. ix. 408.

Lucian, a learned presbyter of Antioch. He adhered for some time to Paul of Samosata. To him most of the churches from Syria to Constantinople, were indebted for corrected copies of the Septuagint. Jerome mentions him as the author of several theological tracts and letters; and a confession of faith, drawn up by him, is still extant, in Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 10, and in Walch's *Biblioth. Symbol. Vetus*, p. 29, &c. He was a very pious man, and suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia, A. D. 311.—See Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13, and ix. 6, and Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 77.

Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop and martyr, was famous at the same period for setting forth correct copies of the Septuagint in Egypt. Whether he was that Hesychius who compiled a useful Greek Lexicon, still extant, is uncertain. He died a martyr, A. D. 311. See Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13, and Fabricius, *Biblioth.* Gr. iv. 554, &c.

Pamphilus the martyr was a native of Berytus, but a presbyter of Cæsarea in Palestine, where he established a school, and

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. State of Christian theology — § 2. Sources of the mystical theology — § 3. Thence the monks and Eremites — § 4. Attention to the Holy Scriptures — § 5. *Origen's* principles of interpretation — § 6. Other interpreters — § 7. State of dogmatic theology — § 8. Moral or practical theology — § 9. Polemic divines — § 10. Faults of the disputants — § 11. Spurious books — § 12. The Chiliastic controversy — § 13. Controversy respecting the baptism of reclaimed heretics — § 14. Disputes concerning *Origen*.

§ 1. To the common people the principal truths of Christianity were explained in their purity and simplicity, and all subtleties were avoided: nor were weak and tender minds overloaded with a multitude of precepts.¹ But in their schools and books, the doctors who cultivated literature and philosophy, especially those of Egypt, deemed it a mark of superior understanding and cultivation to subject divine wisdom to reason, or rather to the precepts of their philosophy, and to investigate a sort of interior sense in the doctrines taught by *Christ*. At the head of this class was *Origen*, who was led, by love of the Platonic philosophy, to bring boldly every part of religion under its laws, and to persuade himself that his admired system could assign the causes and grounds of every doctrine, and determine its operation.² He must, indeed, be acknowledged to

collected a famous theological library. He was a pupil of Pierius, an admirer of Origen, and the great friend and patron of Eusebius. He transcribed most of the works of Origen, with his own hand, particularly the corrected copy of the Septuagint in Origen's *Hexapla*. One of these transcripts, P. D. Huet states, is still in the possession of the Jesuits of Clermont. He composed a biography and vindication of Origen, in five books, to which Eusebius added a sixth book. Only the first book is now extant; and that in a Latin translation of Rufinus, printed *inter Opp. Origenis*.—Pamphilus took great pains to multiply and spread abroad correct copies of the Holy Scriptures.—His life was written by Eusebius, in three books, which are lost. He suffered martyrdom, A. D. 309, at Cæsarea in Palestine. See Euseb. *de Martyribus Palestine*, c. 10 and 7, and *H.E.* vi. 32, vii. 32, and viii. 13. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 75.

Victorinus, bishop of Petavio in Upper Pannonia (Petau in Steyermark), wrote Commentaries on Gen. Exod. Levit. Isa. Ezek. Habak. Eccles. Cant. and the Apocalypse;

also a book against all the Heresies. He died a martyr, A. D. 303. Jerome says, he understood Greek better than Latin; and, therefore, his thoughts are good, but his style is bad.—Dr. Cave (*Histor. Lit.* vol. i.) published a fragment of his Commentary on Genesis. Whether the Commentary on the Apocalypse, now extant under his name, be *his*, has been much doubted; because this comment is *opposed* to Chiliasm, whereas Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* c. 18) says, that Victorinus *favoured* the sentiments of Nepos, and the Chiliasts.—See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 74. Tr.]

¹ See Origen, in *Præf. libror. de Principiis*, Opp. i. 49, and lib. i. *de Princip.* c. vii. p. 69, ed. De la Rue; also Gregory Neocæsar. *Expositio Fidei*, p. 11, Opp. ed. G. Vossii.

² In his *Stromata*, which are lost, and in his work *de Principiis*, which is preserved in the Latin translation of Rufinus.—[See a long note of Dr. Mosheim, on the philosophy and the theology of Origen, in his *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 604, &c. —It does not appear that Origen regarded

have proceeded in this matter with timidity and modesty for the most part; but his example sanctioned this faulty mode of treating theology, and led his disciples to burst the barriers that he prescribed, and to become very licentious in explaining divine truths according to the dictates of philosophy. To these divines as the parents, that species of *theology*, which is called philosophic or *scholastic*, owes its birth; but it afterwards assumed various forms,

reason or philosophy as of higher authority than revelation. He believed, indeed, that there is a true philosophy as well as a false, and that the dictates of the former are to be received and confided in. But he also believed that the Scriptures contain a divine revelation, which is to be received and followed with implicit confidence; and that no philosophy is true which contradicts the plain declarations of the Scriptures. At the same time, he believed that the Scriptures for the most part only state the simple truths and facts of religion, without explaining the grounds and reasons of them; and that they state these truths and facts in a plain and popular manner without acquainting us with the metaphysical nature of the subjects. In his opinion, it was the proper business of reason or philosophy to investigate more fully the causes and grounds of these religious truths and facts, and to examine and determine their metaphysical nature.—Such, it appears, were Origen's fundamental principles. And how few are they who, in this or in any age, have adopted more consistent views! Yet he erred; and erred, just as theologians have ever been prone to do, by relying too confidently on the correctness and certainty of that which he regarded as the conclusions of true philosophy. For an illustration of the nature and extent of Origen's errors, let it be observed, that in the beginning of his book *de Principiis*, § 3, p. 47, he gives the following list of fundamental truths, which he considers as plainly taught in the Scriptures, and of course as never to be called in question; viz. 1. There is one God, the creator and father of all. 2. He, in these last days, sent Christ to call first the Jews and then also other people. 3. Jesus Christ was begotten of the Father before all creatures, and he aided the Father in the whole work of creation. 4. The same Christ becoming man, was incarnate, though he was God; and having become man, he remained God, as he was before; he assumed a body like to ours, and differing only in this, that it was born of the Virgin and of the Holy Spirit; he really and truly suffered, died, and rose again. 5. The Holy Spirit, in honour and dignity, is joined with the Father and the Son. 6. All rational minds possess entire freedom of choice and volition, and when separated from the body, will be

punished or rewarded according to their merits. 7. Our bodies will be raised in a far more perfect state. 8. The devil and his angels are realities, and they seek to involve men in sin. 9. This world will be dissolved. 10. The Scriptures were dictated by the Spirit of God; and they contain a double sense, the one manifest, the other latent. 11. There are holy angels and powers, who minister to the salvation of men. These Origen gives as *specimens* only; for he says: *Hæ sunt species (sorts or specimens) eorum, quæ per prædicationem apostolicam manifeste traduntur*. Now such general truths as these, Origen did not permit to be called in question for a moment. Yet, as before observed, their metaphysical nature, and the grounds and reasons of them, he supposed it the proper business of reason or philosophy to investigate. And his errors were nearly all in relation to religious philosophy, or ontology and metaphysics. He reasoned, and believed, according to the reigning philosophy of the age and country in which he lived. He therefore believed in the pre-existence of human souls, and their incarceration in bodies, for offences previously committed; that the senses are polluting to the soul, and must be all mortified; that all rational beings are left of God to follow their own choice, and are restrained only by motives, the most powerful of which is punishment; and that ultimately God will thus bring all his creatures to be wise and holy and happy. *Tr.*—Even devils were to be eventually purified by the penal processes which they are undergoing, and thus the *final restitution of all things* was to be the complete triumph of a purgatorial system over all the deflexions of God's rational creatures from his own inherent holiness. Huet, accordingly (*Origeniana*, 153), rightly concludes, that Origen admitted no future punishments, but such as are temporary and placular, the very nature assigned by Romanists to purgatorial inflictions. The prevalence of their doctrine owes, probably, much to this great man's *adamantine* powers, but he pushed it further than Rome approves. His own adoption of it was evidently of Platonic growth. See Mr. Soames' *Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, being the Bampton Lecture for 1830, pp. 314, 339. S.]

according to the capacity and erudition of the men who delighted in it.

§ 2. It is a singular circumstance that another species of *theology*, which has been denominated *mystic*, and which has a natural tendency to destroy the former, originated from the same sources, and nearly at the same time. Its authors are unknown; but its causes and the progress of its formation are manifest. Its originators assumed that well-known doctrine of the Platonic school, which was approved also by *Origen* and his followers, that *a portion of the divine nature was diffused through all human souls*; or, to express the same thing in other words, that *reason in us is an emanation from God himself, and comprehends the elements or first principles of all truths human and divine*. Yet they denied that men, by their own efforts and care, can excite this divine spark within them; and, therefore, they disapproved of the endeavours of men to gain clear perceptions of latent truths by means of definitions, discrimination, and reflexion. On the contrary, they maintained that silence, inaction, solitude, repose, the avoidance of all active scenes, and the mortification and subjugation of the body, tended to excite this *internal word* [λόγος, or *reason*], to put forth its hidden energies, and thus to instruct men in divine things. For the men who neglect all human affairs, and withdraw their senses and their eyes from the contagious influence of material objects, do spiritually, or with the mind, return to God again; and being united with God, they not only enjoy wonderful pleasure, but also see in its native purity and undisguised that truth which appears to others only in a vitiated and deformed state.¹

§ 3. Such reasoning induced many in this age to retire into deserts, and to emaciate their bodies by fasting and hardships. And by such motives, rather than by fear of the Decian persecution, I suppose that *Paul* the hermit was led to roam in the deserts of Thebais, and to lead a life more proper for an irrational animal than for a human being.² This *Paul* is said to be the author of the institution of Eremites. But this mode of life prevailed among Christians long before *Paul* the hermit; in fact it was practised long before the Christian era, in Egypt, Syria, India, and Mesopotamia, and it still exists among the Mahometans as well as the Christians in those arid and burning climates.³ For the heated atmosphere which overspreads

¹ [In his *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 658—667, Dr. Mosheim endeavours to show, that Origen, by his religious philosophy, laid the foundations of mystic theology in the Christian church. But the evidence he adduces is by no means conclusive. *Tr.*]

² His life was written by Jerome. [See also the *Acta Sanctorum*, Antwerp, tom. i. January 10th, p. 662. *Schl.*]

³ See the *Travels of Paul Lucas*, A.D. 1714, ii. 363. [The reader will recollect the *Dervises* and *Fakirs*, who roam over

the whole country from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Ganges. — Jerome reports, in the preface to his life of Paul of Thebais, on the questionable authority of Amathas and Macarius, two disciples of St. Anthony, that Paul the hermit of Thebais was the first who practised this mode of life. But high ideas of the sanctity of renouncing social and civilised life and dwelling in deserts among beasts, were prevalent before Paul in the middle of this century turned hermit. Thus Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, obtained great reputation, in the

those countries naturally disposes the inhabitants to repose and indolence, and to court solitude and melancholy.

§ 4. Among those who laudably employed themselves on the sacred volume, the first place is due to such as took earnest care that copies of it might everywhere be found accurately written, and at a moderate price; that it might be translated into other languages; and that amended and faultless editions might become common. Many opulent Christians of those times are known to have expended no small portion of their estates in furtherance of these objects. In correcting the copies of the Septuagint version *Pierius* and *Hesychius* in Egypt, and *Lucian* at Antioch, employed themselves with praiseworthy industry. Nor should the nearly similar efforts of *Pamphilus* the martyr be passed without notice. But *Origen* surpassed all others in diligence and patient labour in this way. His *Hexapla*, though [nearly] destroyed by the ravages of time, will remain an eternal monument of the incredible application with which that great man laboured to serve the interests of Christianity.¹

§ 5. The same *Origen* unquestionably stands at the head of the interpreters of the Bible in this century. But with pain it must be added, that he was first among those who have found in the Scriptures a secure retreat for errors and idle fancies of all kinds. As this most ingenious man could see no feasible method of vindicating all that Scripture says, against the cavils of heretics and enemies of Christianity, if its language were interpreted literally, he concluded that he must expound the sacred volume upon the principles which the Platonists used in explaining the history of the gods. He therefore taught that the words in many parts of the Bible convey no meaning at all; and in places where he admitted certain ideas to lie under the terms used, he contended for a hidden and recondite sense of them, altogether different from their natural import, but far preferable to it.² And this hidden sense it is that he searches after in

close of the *second* century, by secreting himself many years in the desert. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 9, 10. The origin of religious eremitism may perhaps be traced back to the early pagan philosophers; for Porphyry (*περὶ ἀποχῆς*, § 35) assures us, that the ancient Pythagoreans were distinguished for their attachment to this mode of life. *Tr.*]

¹ The fragments of this Herculean work which are preserved, have been collected and published by the late chief of the learned Benedictines, Bernh. de Montfaucon, Paris, 1713, 2 vols. fol. See also J. F. Buddeus, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, ii. 1376, &c.; and J. G. Carpzov, *Critica Sacra Vet. Test.* p. 574.—[Origen published both a *Tetrapla* and a *Hexapla*; that is, a *fourfold* and a *sixfold* Bible. The former contained, in parallel columns, 1. Aquila's Greek version; 2. that of Symmachus; 3. the Septuagint version; 4. the Greek ver-

sion of Theodotion. The *Hexapla* contained, throughout, *six* columns, generally *eight*, and occasionally *nine*; thus arranged,—1. The Hebrew text in the Hebrew character; 2. The Hebrew text in Greek characters; 3. Aquila's version; 4. that of Symmachus; 5. the Septuagint; 6. that of Theodotion; 7. and 8. two other Greek versions, the authors of which were unknown; 9. another Greek version. The three last, being anonymous versions, are denominated the *Fifth*, *Sixth*, and *Seventh* Greek versions. The most useful parts of Montfaucon's *Hexapla*, with additions, corrections, and notes, have been published in two vols. 8vo, by C. F. Bahrtdt, Lips. 1769—70. *Tr.*]

² Here may be consulted the Preface of Charles de la Rue to the second volume of Origen's works, ed. Paris, 1733, fol. With greater fulness and precision I have stated and explained Origen's system of biblical interpretation, in my *Comment. de Rebus*

his commentaries, ingeniously indeed, but perversely, and generally

Christianor. &c. p. 629, where also his philosophy, his theology, and his contest with bishop Demetrius, are formally taken up and discussed. [Compare Ernesti, *Dissertatio de Origene, interpretationis librorum SS. grammaticæ auctore*, written A.D. 1756. He shows that the merits of this Christian father, in regard to the criticism and exposition of the Old and New Testaments, were by no means small. The leading thoughts of Mosheim, as stated in his *Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c.* are the following. Origen was not the inventor of the allegorical mode of expounding the Scriptures. It was in use among the Jews before the Christian era. (Ernesti goes further, and seeks its origin in the schools of the prophets.) Philo was a great allegorist; and Pantæus and Clemens Alex. were the first Christian allegorists. Origen took greater liberties in this mode of interpretation; and it was not simply his resorting to allegories, but his excesses in them, that drew upon him enemies. Before his day, all interpreters explained the narrations and the laws contained in the Bible, according to their literal meaning. But Origen perversely turned a large part of biblical history into moral fables, and many of the laws into allegories. Probably he learned this in the school of Ammonius, which expounded Hesiod, Homer, and the whole fabulous history of the Greeks allegorically. The predecessors of Origen, who searched after a mystical sense of Scripture, still set a high value on the grammatical or literal sense: but he often expresses himself as if he attached no value to it. Before him, allegories were resorted to, only to discover predictions of future events, and rules for moral conduct: but he betook himself to allegories in order to establish the principles of his philosophy on a scriptural basis. All this must have been offensive to many Christians. His propensity to allegories must be ascribed to the fertility of his invention, the prevailing custom of the Egyptians, his education, the instructions he received from his teachers, and the example both of the philosophers, of whom he was an admirer, and of the Jews, especially Philo. To these may be added other causes. He hoped, by means of his allegories, more easily to convince the Jews, to confute the Gnostics, and to silence the objections of both. This he himself tells us, *de Principiis*, viii. 8, p. 164, &c. But we must not forget his attachment to that system of philosophy which he embraced. This philosophy could not be reconciled with the Scriptures, except by a resort to allegories; and, therefore, the Scriptures must be interpreted allegorically, that they might not

contradict his philosophy. The Platonic idea of a twofold world, a visible and an invisible, and the one emblematic of the other, led him to search for a figurative description of the invisible world, in the biblical history of the nations of the earth. He also believed that it was doing honour to the Holy Scriptures, to consider them as diverse from all human compositions, and as containing hidden mysteries. See his *Homil. xv. on Genesis*, Opp. ii. 99; and *Homil. on Exod.* Opp. ii. 129. And, finally, he thought that many of the objections of the enemies of religion could not be fully answered without recurrence to allegories. His general principles for the interpretation of the sacred volume resolve themselves into the following positions. 1. The Scriptures resemble man. As a man consists of three parts, a rational spirit, a sensitive soul, and a visible body, so the Scriptures have a threefold sense, a *literal* sense, corresponding with the body, a *moral* sense, analogous to the sensitive soul, and a *mystical* or *spiritual* sense, analogous to the rational spirit. *Homil. v. on Levit.* § 5, Opp. ii. 209. 2. As the body is the baser part of man, so the *literal* is the less worthy sense of Scripture. And as the body often betrays good men into sin, so the literal sense often leads us into error. *Stromata*, l. x. quoted by Jerome, b. iii. *Comment. on Galat.* ch. iii. Opp. i. 41. 3. Yet the literal sense is not wholly useless. *De Principiis*, l. iv. § 12, p. 169, and § 14, p. 173. 4. They who would see further into the Scriptures than the common people, must search out the *moral* sense. 5. And the perfect, or those who have attained to the highest degree of blessedness, must also investigate the *spiritual* sense. *De Principiis*, l. iv. § 2, p. 168. 6. The *moral* sense of Scripture instructs us relative to the changes in the mind of man, and gives rules for regulating the heart and life. 7. The *spiritual* sense acquaints us with the nature and state and history of the *spiritual world*. For, besides this material world, there is a spiritual world, composed of two parts, the heavenly and the earthly. The *earthly*, mystical or spiritual world, is the Christian church on earth. The *heavenly*, mystical world is above; and corresponds in all its parts with the lower world, which was formed after its model. 8. As the Scripture contains the history of this twofold mystic world, so there is a twofold mystic sense of Scripture, an *allegorical* and an *anagogical*. 9. The *mystic* sense is diffused throughout the Holy Scriptures. 10. Yet we do not always meet with *both* the allegorical sense and the anagogical in every passage. 11. The *moral* sense likewise pervades the whole Bible.

to the entire neglect and contempt of the literal meaning.¹ This remote sense he moreover divides into the *moral* and the *mystical* or *spiritual*; the former containing instructions relative to the internal state of the soul and our external actions, and the latter acquainting us with the nature, the history, and the laws of the *spiritual* or *mystical world*. He fancied that this *mystical world* was also two-fold, partly *superior* or *celestial*, and partly *inferior* and *terrestrial*, that is, the church: and hence he divided the mystical sense of Scripture into the *terrene* or *allegorical*, and the *celestial* or *anagogical*. This mode of interpreting Scripture, which was sanctioned by Jewish practice, was current among Christians before the times of *Origen*. But as he gave determinate rules for it, and brought it into a systematic form, he is commonly regarded as its originator.

§ 6. Innumerable expositors in this and the following centuries pursued the method of *Origen*, though with some diversity; nor could the few who pursued a better method, make much head against them. The commentaries of *Hippolytus*, which have reached us, show that this holy man went entirely into *Origen's* method. And no better, probably, were the expositions of some books of the Old and New Testaments, composed by *Victorinus*, but which are now lost. But the *Paraphrase on the book of Ecclesiastes*, by *Gregory*

12. But the *literal* sense does not occur everywhere: for many passages have no literal meaning. 13. Some passages have only two senses: namely, a *moral* and a *mystical* [the *mystical* being either *allegorical* or *anagogical*, rarely both]; other passages have three senses [the *moral*, the *mystical*, and the *literal*]. 14. The *literal* sense is perceived by every attentive reader. The *moral* sense is somewhat more difficult to be discovered. 15. But the *mystic* sense none can discover with certainty, unless they are wise men, and also taught of God. 16. Neither can even such men hope to fathom all the mysteries of the sacred volume. 17. In searching for the *anagogical* sense, especially, a person must proceed with peculiar care and caution. *Schl.*—Mosheim states the following as *Origen's* general rule for determining when a passage of Scripture may be taken literally, and when not: viz. Whenever the words, if understood literally, will afford a valuable meaning, one that is worthy of God, useful to men, and accordant with truth and correct reason, then the literal meaning is to be retained: but whenever the words, if understood literally, will express what is absurd, or false, or contrary to correct reason, or useless, or unworthy of God, then the literal sense is to be discarded, and the moral and mystical alone to be regarded. This rule he applies to every part both of the Old Test. and the New. And he assigns two reasons why fables and literal absurdities are admitted into the sacred

volume. The *first* is, that if the literal meaning were always rational and good, the reader would be apt to rest in it, and not look after the moral and mystical sense. The *second* is, that fabulous and incongruous representations often afford moral and mystical instruction, which could not so well be conveyed by sober facts and representations. *De Principiis*, l. iv. § 15, 16, tom. x. *Comment.* in *Joh. Tr.*]

¹ *Origen*, in his *Stromata*, l. x. cited by Ch. de la Rue, *Opp.* i. 41, says: *Multorum malorum occasio est, si quis in carne Scripturæ manserit. Quæ qui fecerint, regnum Dei non consequentur. Quamobrem spiritum Scripturæ fructusque quæramus, qui non dicuntur manifesti.* He had said a little before: *Non valde eos juvat Scriptura, qui eam intelligunt, ut scripta est.* Who would suppose such declarations could fall from the lips of a wise and considerate man? But this excellent man suffered himself to be misled by the causes mentioned, and by his love of philosophy. He could not discover in the sacred books all that he considered true, so long as he adhered to the literal sense; but allow him to abandon the literal sense, and to search for recondite meanings, and those books would contain Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and the whole tribe of philosophers. And thus, nearly all those who would model Christianity according to their own fancy, or their favourite system of philosophy, have run into this mode of interpreting Scripture.

Thaumaturgus, which remains, is not liable to the same objection, although its author was a great admirer of Origen. *Methodius* explained the book of Genesis, and the Canticles; but his labours have not reached us. *Ammonius* composed a harmony of the Gospels.

§ 7. *Origen*, in his last work entitled *Stromata*, and in his four books *de Principiis*, explained most of the doctrines of Christianity, or, to speak more correctly, deformed them with philosophical speculations. And these his books *de Principiis* were the first compendium of scholastic, or, if you please, philosophic theology. Something similar was attempted by *Theognostus*, in his seven books of *Hypotyposes*; for a knowledge of which we are indebted to *Photius*,¹ who says that they were the work of a man infected with the opinions of Origen. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, in his *Expositio Fidei*, gave a brief summary of Christian doctrines. Certain points of the Christian faith were taken up by various individuals, in reply to the enemies or the corruptors of Christianity. Tracts on the Deity, the resurrection, antichrist, and the end of the world, were composed by *Hippolytus*. *Methodius* wrote on free-will; and *Lucian* on the creed. But as most of these treatises are no longer extant, their characters are little known.

§ 8. Among the writers on moral subjects (or practical theology), passing by *Tertullian*, who was mentioned under the preceding century, the first place belongs perhaps to *Cyprian*. From the pen of this extraordinary man we have treatises on the *advantages of patience*, on *morality*, on *alms and good works*, and an *exhortation to martyrdom*. In these works there are many excellent thoughts, but they are not arranged neatly and happily, nor sustained by solid arguments.² *Origen* wrote, among other works of a practical nature, an *exhortation to martyrdom*; a topic discussed by many in that age, with different degrees of eloquence and perspicacity. *Methodius* treated of chastity, but in a confused manner, in his *Fest of Virgins*. *Dionysius* of Alexandria wrote on *penance* and on *temptations*. To mention other writers in this department would be needless.

§ 9. Of polemic writers a host might be mentioned. The idolaters were assailed by *Minucius Felix*, in his dialogue entitled *Octavius*; by *Origen*, in his eight books *against Celsus*; by *Arnobius*, in his eight books *against the Gentiles*; and by *Cyprian*, in his tract *on the Vanity of Idols*. The *Chronicon* of *Hippolytus*, written against the Gentiles, and the work of *Methodius* in opposition to *Porphry*, who attacked Christianity, are lost. We may also place among polemic writers both those who wrote against the philosophers, as *Hippolytus*, who wrote against *Plato*, and those who treated of *fate*, of *free-will*, and of the *origin of evil*, as *Hippolytus*, *Methodius*,

¹ [Photius, *Biblioth.* cod. cvi. p. 279. Photius represents him as erring, with Origen, in regard to the character of the Son of God. But G. Bull defends him against this charge, in his *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*,

sec. 2, c. 10, § 7, p. 135. — See concerning him, Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* l. v. c. 1, vol. v. 276, and l. v. c. 88, vol. ix. p. 408. *Schl.*]

² See J. Barbeyrac, *de la Morale des Pères*, c. viii. p. 104, &c.

and others. Against the Jews, *Hippolytus* attempted something, which has not reached us; but the *Testimonies* [from Scripture] *against the Jews*, by *Cyprian*, are still extant. Against all the sectarians and heretics, assaults were made by *Origen*, *Victorinus*, and *Hippolytus*, but nothing of these works has come down to us. It would be superfluous here to enumerate those who wrote against individual heretics.

§ 10. But it must by no means pass unnoticed, that the discussions instituted against the opposers of Christianity in this age, departed far from the primitive simplicity, and the correct method of controversy. For the Christian doctors, who were in part educated in the schools of rhetoricians and sophists, inconsiderately transferred the arts of these teachers to the cause of Christianity; and therefore considered it of no importance whether an antagonist were confounded by artifice or solid argument. Thus that mode of disputing which the ancients called *economical*,¹ and which had victory rather than truth for its object, was almost universally approved. And the Platonists contributed to the currency of the practice, by asserting that it was no sin in a person to employ falsehood and fallacies for the support of truth, when it was in danger of being borne down. Any one ignorant of these facts will be but a poor judge of the arguments of *Origen* in his book *against Celsus*, and of the others who wrote against the worshippers of idols. *Tertullian's* method of confuting heretics, namely by *prescription*, was not perhaps altogether unsuitable in that age. But they who think it always proper to reason in this manner, must have little knowledge of the difference which time and change of circumstances produce.²

§ 11. This vicious disposition to circumvent and confound an adversary, rather than confute him with sound argument, produced also a multitude of books falsely bearing on their fronts the names of certain distinguished men. For, a great part of mankind being influenced more by authorities, than by reasons and divine declarations,

¹ Souverain, *Platonisme dévoilé*, p. 244. J. Daillé, *de vero Usu Patrum*, l. i. p. 160. J. C. Wolfii *Casauboniana*, p. 100. On the phrase to do a thing, κατ' οἰκονομίαν, Tho. Gataker has treated largely, in his notes on *M. Antoninus*, l. xi. p. 330, &c. [See note to Cent. ii. p. ii. c. 3, § 8.]

² See Fred. Spanheim, *Diss. de Præscriptione in Rebus Fidei*, Opp. tom. iii. p. 1079. —[*Tertullian's* book was entitled *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, or *Præscriptionibus adversus Hæreticos*; which might be translated, on the *Presumption* in regard to heretics, or *Presumptions* against them. The author attempts to confute all the heretics at once, and by means of historical arguments. He maintains that the orthodox churches were founded by the apostles and their approved assistants, who ordained the first pastors of these churches, and established in them all one and the same faith,

which must of course be genuine Christianity; and that this faith having been handed down pure and uncorrupted, is now contained in the creeds and inculcated in the assemblies of these churches. But that not one of these things can be said of the heretical churches, which had not such an origin, and embraced various differing creeds, and creeds derived from other sources. Being bred an advocate, and familiar with the proceedings of courts, he gives a forensic form to his argument, not only by using the law term *Præscriptio*, but by maintaining that the orthodox were, and had always been, in right and lawful possession of that invaluable treasure, true Christianity; and that, of course, the heretics, who were never in possession of it, in vain attempt now to oust them of what they thus hold by legal prescription. Tr.]

individuals endeavoured to stifle opposition, by pretending to derive their opinions from the most venerable sources. Hence those *Canons* which were falsely ascribed to the apostles:¹ hence those *Apostolic Constitutions* which *Clemens Romanus* was reputed to have collected:² hence, too, the *Recognitions of Clement*,³ as they are called, and the *Clementina*,⁴ and other works of the like character, which a too credulous world long held in high estimation. By the same artifice the *mystics*, as they are called, sought to advance their cause. Having no means of replying to those who asked for the first author of this new sort of wisdom, they declared themselves to have received it from *Dionysius*, the Areopagite, a contemporary with the apostles; and, to make the falsehood plausible, they passed off books void of

¹ [The *Apostolic Canons* are eighty-five ecclesiastical laws or rules, professedly enacted by the apostles, and collected and preserved by *Clemens Romanus*. The matter of them is ancient; for they describe the customs and institutions of Christians, particularly of the Greek and oriental churches, in the *second* and *third* centuries. But the phraseology indicates a compiler living in the *third* century. See W. Beveridge's notes on these Canons, and his *Codex Canonum Eccles. Primitivæ, vindicatus et illustrat.* London, 1678, 4to. *Schl.*—They are to be found in the *Corpus Juris Canonici* and in the *Concilia*. *Tr.*]

² [The *Apostolic Constitutions* fill eight books. They prescribe the constitution, organisation, discipline, and worship of the church, with great particularity; and avowedly are the work of the apostles themselves. But they are supposed to have been compiled in the eastern or Greek church, in the latter part of the *third*, or beginning of the *fourth* century. Some place them in the fourth or fifth century. They bear marks of an Arian hand. As describing the form, discipline, and ceremonies of the church about the year 300, they are of some value. They may be seen in *Cotelieri Patres Apostolici*, tom. ii. *Tr.*]

³ [The *Apostolic Canons and Constitutions* were ascribed to *Clement* as the collector and publisher only; the *Recognitions*, *Clementina*, &c. as author. The writings of the latter class are three different works on the same subject, and on the same general plan. They all, doubtless, had the same author, who rewrote his own work for the sake of giving it a better form. The substance of them all is *Clement's* history of his own dissatisfaction with paganism, his first and slight knowledge of Christianity, which induced him to journey from Rome to Palestine; there he met with St. Peter, and for some time resided and travelled with him, heard his public discourses, and witnessed his combats, especially with Simon

Magus; and in private conversations with the apostles, everything pertaining not only to Christianity, but to cosmogony, physics, pneumatology, &c. was fully explained to him. The three works often relate precisely the same things and in the same words; but they not unfrequently differ in the fulness of their details, and in many of the minor points both of doctrine and of fact. The first is entitled *Sancti Clementis Romani Recognitiones*. The original is lost; so that we have only the Latin translation of *Rufinus*. It is divided into ten books, and fills 111 large folio pages. The *second* is the *Clementina* (τὰ Κλημεντῖνα), first published, Gr. and Lat., by *Cotelier*. It fills 146 folio pages. It commences with an epistle of Peter, and another of *Clement*, addressed to the apostle James. The body of the work, instead of being divided into books and chapters, like the *Recognitions*, is thrown into nineteen discourses, or homilies (ὁμιλῆαι), as delivered by Peter, but committed to writing by *Clement*. The *third* is the *Clementine Epitome*, or abridged account of the acts, travels, and discourses of Peter, together with the epistle of *Clement* to James, Gr. and Lat., pp. 52, fol. This is, as its title implies, a mere abridgment of the two preceding works. *Tr.*—*Dr. Mosheim* conjectures that the *Recognitions* were composed by an Alexandrian Jew. The *Clementina* may have been the work of an *Ebionite*. *Schl.*—Both are downright romance, but not uninteresting as specimens of the speculations of semi-christians of a philosophic turn who lived about A.D. 200. *Tr.*—*Gieseler*, i. 211, maintains that the *Clementines* represent the *Elcesaitic* doctrines, which were purified and modified by an Alexandrian in the *Recognitions*, and abridged and reduced to orthodoxy much later in the *Epitome*. The *Recognitions* were published in Syriac by *Dr. de la Garde*, Leipsic and London, 1861. *Ed.*]

⁴ See the last note.

sense and reason, as works of so great a man.¹ Thus those who wished to surpass all others in piety deemed it pious to employ deception and fraud in support of piety.

§ 12. Among the controversies which divided Christians in this century, the most considerable turned upon the *millennium*, the *baptism of heretics*, and *Origen*. That the Saviour is to reign a thousand years among men before the end of the world, had been believed by many in the preceding century, without offence to any: all, however, had not explained the doctrine in the same manner, nor indulged hopes of the same kind of pleasures during that reign.² In this century the millenarian doctrine fell into disrepute, through the influence especially of *Origen*, who opposed it because it contravened some of his opinions.³ But *Nepos*, an Egyptian bishop,

¹ [The spurious works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite (who is mentioned Acts xvii. 34) are the following: *de Cœlesti Hierarchia*, lib. i.; *de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, l. i.; *de Divinis Nominibus*, l. i.; *de Mystica Theologia*, l. i. together with four Epistles to Caius, one to Dorotheus, one to Sosipater, one to Polycarp, one to Demophilus, one to Titus, one to Apollonphanes, and two to St. John the apostle. They all relate to the mystic theology, and breathe a devout spirit, but are exceedingly obscure and difficult of comprehension. It is supposed they were written in the fourth or fifth century, as they bear marks of that period, and are not mentioned by any writer prior to the sixth century. During the middle ages they were held in high estimation, and their genuineness scarcely if at all questioned. The more devout Roman Catholics, and most of the early Protestants, received them and relied upon them as genuine. In the seventeenth century, their spuriousness was abundantly demonstrated, and they are now universally regarded as supposititious. The best edition of these works, Gr. and Lat., with copious notes, is that of Balthazar Corderius, Antwerp, 1634, 2 vols. fol. and Paris, 1644, embracing the Greek scholia of St. Maximus the martyr (A.D. 659), and the paraphrase of George Pachymeres (A.D. 1280). The MS. copies of these works are found in most of the great libraries of Europe. Tr.]

² [See the learned *Treatise concerning the true Millennium*, which Dr. Whitby has subjoined to the second volume of his *Commentary upon the New Testament*. See also, for an account of the doctrine of the ancient Millennarians, the fourth, fifth, seventh, and ninth volumes of Lardner's *Credibility*, &c. Macl.—also H. Corodi's *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, 2nd ed. 1794, 3 vols. 8vo. Tr.]

³ See Origen, *de Principiis*, ii. 11. Opp. i. 104. and *Prolog. Comment. in Cantic.*

Canticor. iii. 28. — [The Cerinthians, Marcionites, Montanists, and Melitans, among the heretical sects, and among the orthodox fathers, Papias, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, held to a millennial reign of Christ, and Irenæus understood it in a very gross sense. Mosheim, in his *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 721, believed that the doctrine had a Jewish origin; and he supposed the Christian doctors to have received, or at least tolerated it, because they hoped by it to make the Jews more willing to embrace Christianity. But Walch, in his *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 143, is more discriminating, and maintains that the question, whether a millennial reign of Christ is to be expected, had a biblical origin, the earlier Chiliasts relying on the testimony of the *Apocalypse*: but the explanation of the doctrine was derived from the Jewish opinions. There were two kinds of Chiliasts, the gross and the refined. The latter placed the chief differences between the millennial reign of Christ and his present reign, in the higher enjoyment of spiritual advantages and pleasures, yet without wholly excluding the pleasures of sense. But the former expected, in the millennium, all kinds of sensual delights, and the free indulgence of all, even the most exorbitant lusts. All these gross Chiliasts are to be found not merely among the heretics; they may be found also among the orthodox, as the example of Irenæus proves. According to the account of Gennadius of Marseilles, *de Dogmat. Ecclesiast.* c. 55, p. 32, the Chiliasts may be divided into four classes. The first class were the most moderate. They are called Melitans; and expected a fulfilment of the divine promises here on the earth, without attempting to define the nature of the bliss to be enjoyed during the millennium. The second class expected not only to enjoy the indispensable indulgences of appetite, but also marriage pleasures, and every species of sensual indulgence. The third class promised themselves indeed sen-

attempted to revive its authority, in a work written *against the allegorists*, as he contemptuously styled the opposers of the millennium. The book and its arguments were approved by many in the province of Arsinoë, and particularly by *Coracion*, a presbyter of some respectability and influence. But *Dionysius* of Alexandria, a disciple of *Origen*, allayed the rising storm by his oral discussions and his two books *on the divine promises*.¹

§ 13. As no law determined in what manner those who came over from heretical churches to the Catholic Christians were to be received, usage in this matter was not uniform. Many of the Orientals and Africans classed reclaimed heretics among catechumens, and admitted them to the Christian ordinances by baptism. But most of the Europeans judged the baptism of erring Christians to be valid; and therefore received reclaimed heretics simply with imposition of hands and prayer. This diversity long produced no contention. But in this century the Asiatic Christians determined in several councils what before had been left at discretion, that all heretics coming over to the true church must be rebaptized.² This coming to the knowledge of *Stephen*, bishop of Rome, he with little humanity or prudence excluded those Asiatics from communion with him and his church. Notwithstanding, however, *Cyprian*, with other Africans, in a council called on the subject, embraced the opinion of the Asiatics, and gave notice of it to *Stephen*. Upon this, *Stephen* was very indignant; but *Cyprian* replied with energy, and, in a new council at Carthage, again pronounced the baptism of heretics wholly invalid. *Stephen's* anger now became heavier, and he excluded with great unkindness the Africans from the rights of brotherhood. The discord was healed,

sitive delights, and these too as rewards for foregoing them now, and as a compensation for the outward sufferings of saints; but they excluded from them the carnal pleasure of sexual intercourse. The *fourth* was composed of *Nepos* and his followers. The millennial doctrine did not prevail everywhere, and uncontradicted. Yet the believers and the rejectors of the doctrine treated each other with affection, and a person might believe or discard it, without bringing his orthodoxy under suspicion. The first open opposer of Chiliasm that we meet with, was *Caius*, a teacher in the church of Rome, towards the end of the second century. He denied that the *Apocalypse* was written by *John*, and ascribed it rather to *Cerinthus*. But he effected very little. *Origen* was a more powerful opposer of the doctrine. He did not, like *Caius*, deny the canonical authority of the *Apocalypse*, but explained the passages in it which describe the millennial reign of *Christ*, allegorically, as referring to spiritual delights, suited to the nature of spirits raised to perfection, and these to be enjoyed, not on the earth, but in the world to come. *Schl.*]

¹ See *Eusebius*, *H. E.* vii. 24, and *Gen-*

nadius Massiliensis, *de Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 55, p. 32, ed. Elmenhorst. — [*Nepos* held the *Apocalypse* to be an inspired book; and he maintained, in opposition to the allegorists, that the passages which speak of a millennial reign of *Christ*, must be understood literally, and as promising corporeal and sensitive pleasures. But he does not appear to have defined clearly what these pleasures were to be, though he excluded eating and drinking, and marriage, as *Mosheim* supposes, l. c. p. 726. The very obscure and defective history of *Nepos*, and the controversy with him, is explained, as far as it can be, by *Walch*, l. c. p. 152—167. *Schl.*]

² *Eusebius*, *H. E.* vii. 5 and 7. *Firmilian*, *Epist. ad Cyprianum*, inter *Epp. Cyprian.* 75. — [The councils which decided this point, before *Stephen's* rash procedure, were (1) the council of Carthage, about A. D. 215. See *Epp. Cypr.* 71 and 73. — (2) that of Iconium in Phrygia, A. D. 235. *Epp. Cypr.* 75. *Euseb. H. E.* vii. 4. — (3) that of Synnada, and (4) some others, which are barely mentioned in *Epp. Cypr.* 75, and *Euseb. ubi supra*. See *Walch, Historie der Kirchenversamml.* p. 91, 94, and 96. *Tr.*]

partly by the moderation of the Africans, partly by the death of Stephen.¹

§ 14. The Origenian contests were moved by *Demetrius*, bishop of Alexandria, whom Origen's friends represent as influenced by envy and hatred; which, however, is very doubtful. In the proceedings of Demetrius against Origen, one may discover marks of a mind exasperated, impassioned, arrogant, and unreasonable, but none scarcely of envy.² In the year 228, *Origen* undertook a journey to Achaia, and on his way suffered himself to be ordained presbyter by the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem. *Demetrius* took this very ill, not only deeming Origen unworthy of the presbyter's office, because he had emasculated himself, but also denying that the master of his own school ought to be promoted without his knowledge and consent. The matter, however, was compromised, and Origen returned to Alexandria. But not long after, from some unknown cause, new dissension arose between him and Demetrius, which became so great, that Origen left Alexandria and the school in the year 231, and removed to Cæsarea in Palestine. Demetrius accused him in his absence before an assembled council, and deprived him of his office without a hearing, and afterwards, in a second council, divested him of his priestly character. It is probable that Demetrius accused Origen before the council, particularly the last one, of erroneous sentiments in matters of religion; which it was easy for him to do, as *Origen's* book *de Principiis*, which was full of dangerous sentiments, had been published not long before. The decision of the Alexandrian council was approved by a majority of the Christian bishops, though rejected by those of Achaia, Palestine, Phœnicia, and Arabia.³

¹ Cyprian, *Ep.* 70 and 73, and several others, ed. Baluze. Augustine, *de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, l. vi. and vii. Opp. t. ix. where he gives the acts of the council of Carthage, A.D. 256. Prudent. Maran, *Vita Cypriani*, p. 107, and all the writers of the life of Cyprian. [See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 540—547, and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 328—384. *Schl.*]

² [Mosheim is singular in this opinion, which he defends at great length, in his *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 671, &c. in opposition to the express testimony of Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 8, and Jerome, *Epist.* 29. Opp. t. iv. pt. ii. p. 68. If Demetrius was not envious of the growing reputation of Origen, or otherwise affected by personal antipathy, it seems impossible to account for

his rancour. *Tr.*]

³ This account is derived from the original sources, especially from Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 23. Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* cxviii. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* and Origen himself. It differs, in some respects, from that given by the common writers, Doucin, Huet, and others. [That Demetrius accused Origen of erroneous sentiments, is a mere conjecture of Mosheim. The early writers mention nothing of it, but state distinctly other charges as adduced by the persecuting bishop. And that Demetrius assembled two councils, is not clear: see Walch, *Historie der Kirchenversamml.* p. 92, &c. *Tr.*—See Neale's *Hist. Patriarchate of Alexandria*, i. 24. *Ed.*]

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS RITES.

§ 1. Rites multiplied—§ 2. Public worship—§ 3. Administration of the sacred supper—
§ 4. Baptism—§ 5. Various other rites.

§ 1. ALL the monuments of this century which have come down to us, show that there was a great increase of ceremonies. To the causes of this, which have already been mentioned, may be added the passion for Platonic philosophy, or rather, the popular superstition of the oriental nations respecting demons, which was adopted by the Platonists, and received from them by the Christian doctors. For in these opinions concerning the nature and propensities of attendant spirits, the origins of many rites are to be sought. Hence arose public exorcisms, multiplication of fasts, and aversion to matrimony. Hence men were dissuaded from intercourse with those who either were not yet baptized, or had been excluded from the communion of the church; because such were considered as under the power of some evil spirit. And, to pass over other things, hence the painful austerities and penances which were enjoined upon offenders.¹

§ 2. That the Christians now had in most provinces certain edifices in which they assembled for religious worship, will be denied by no candid and impartial person. Nor would I contend, strenuously, against those who think these edifices to have been generally now adorned with images and other ornaments.² As to the forms of public worship, and the times set apart for it, it is unnecessary here to be particular, since little alteration was made in this century. Yet two things deserve notice. *First*, the public discourses to the people underwent a change. For, not to mention *Origen*, who was the first, so far as we know, that made long discourses in public, and in such discourses expounded the sacred volume, there were certain bishops, who, being educated in the schools of the rhetoricians, framed their addresses and exhortations according to the rules of Grecian eloquence; and their example met with most ready approbation. *Secondly*, the use of incense was now introduced, at least into many churches. Very learned men have denied this fact; but they do it in the face of testimony altogether unexceptionable.³

¹ Whoever desires to look farther into this subject, may consult Porphyry, *on Abstinence from Flesh*; and various passages in Eusebius, *Preparat. Evang.* and Theodoret; comparing them with the Christian institutions.

² [As yet no other than *symbolical*

figures were used'—e. g. the good shepherd, the ship, the fish, &c. Robertson, i. 150. *Ed.*]

³ Wm. Beveridge, *ad Canon. iii. Apostol.* p. 461; and his *Codex Canon. vindicatus*, p. 78. [The Christians originally abhorred the use of incense in public worship, as

§ 3. Those who had the direction of religious worship, annexed longer prayer and more of ceremony to the celebration of the Lord's Supper; and this, I suppose, with no bad intentions. Neither those doing penance, nor those not yet baptized, were allowed to be present at the celebration of this ordinance; which practice, it is well known, was derived from the pagan mysteries.¹ That golden and silver vessels were used in it, is testified by *Prudentius*,² among others; and I see no reason to doubt the fact, in respect to the more opulent Christian churches. The time of its administration was different, according to the state and circumstances of the churches. Some deemed the morning, some the afternoon, and some the evening, to be the most suitable time for its celebration.³ Neither were all agreed how often this most sacred ordinance should be repeated.⁴ But all believed it absolutely necessary to the attainment of salvation; and therefore everywhere would have infants even partake of it.⁵ Sacred feasts in some places preceded it—in others, followed.⁶

§ 4. *Baptism* was publicly administered twice a year to candidates who had gone through a long preparation and trial,⁷ none looking on but such as had been themselves already baptized. The effect of baptism was supposed to be the remission of sins: and the bishop, by the imposition of hands and prayer, it was believed, conferred those gifts of the Holy Spirit which were necessary for living a holy life.⁸ Of the principal ceremonies attending baptism, we have before

being a part of the worship of idols. See Tertullian, *Apolog.* c. 42; and *de Corona militis*, c. 10. Yet they permitted its use at funerals, against offensive smells. Afterwards it was used at the induction of magistrates and bishops, and also in public worship, to temper the bad air of crowded assemblies in hot countries, and at last degenerated into a superstitious rite. *Schl.*]

¹ [See Christ. Matth. Pfaff, Diss. 2, *de Præjudicio Theolog.* § 13, p. 149, &c.; and Jos. Bingham, *Antiquitates Eccles.* l. x. c. 5. *Schl.*]

² *Περὶ στεφάν.* Hymn ii. p. 60, ed. Heinsii [and Optatus Milevit, *de Schismate Donatist.* c. 12, p. 17. *Schl.*—The heathen pretent in Prudentius only mentions the use of costly vessels by Christians as a report, but the rumour was probably not without some ground.]

*Hunc esse vestris orgiis
Moremque et artem proditum est,
Hanc disciplinam fœderis,
Libent ut auro antistites.
Argenteis scyphis ferunt
Fumare sacrum sanguinem,
Auroque nocturnis sacris
Astare fixos cereos.'*

Aurel. Prudent. ed. Valpy, p. 183. *S.]*

³ [See Cyprian, *Ep.* 63, p. 104. *Schl.*]

⁴ [It was commonly administered every Sunday, as well as on other festival

days; and in times of persecution daily. See Cyprian, *de Oratione Domin.* p. 209. *Ep.* 56, p. 90, *ep.* 54, p. 78, ed. Baluze. *Schl.*]

⁵ [Dionysius Alex. (cited by Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11) "calls it αἰσθητὴν μετὰ τοῦ Κυρίου συναγωγὴν. That children partook of it, is testified by Cyprian, *de Lapsis*, p. 184 and 189, ed. Baluze. See P. Zorn's *Historia Eucharist. Infantum*, c. 4, § 1, &c. and c. 6, § 3; also J. Bingham, *Antiquitates Eccles.* book xv. ch. 4, § 7. *Schl.*]

⁶ [Chrysostom, *Homil.* 22. *Oportet hæresis esse*, Opp. v. *Schl.*]

⁷ [In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, book viii. ch. 32, a three years' preparation was enjoined; yet with allowance of some exceptions. *Schl.*]

⁸ This may be placed beyond all controversy by many passages from the fathers of this century. And as it will conduce much to an understanding of the theology of the ancients, which differed in many respects from ours, I will adduce a single passage from Cyprian. It is in his *Epist.* 73, p. 131. *Manifestum est autem, ubi et per quos remissa peccatorum dari possit, quæ in baptismo scilicet datur. — Qui vero præpositis ecclesiæ offeruntur, per nostram orationem et manus impositionem Spiritum sanctum consequuntur.* See also a passage from Dionysius Alex. in Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 8.

spoken.¹ A few things, however, must here be added. None were admitted to the sacred font until the exorcist had, with long and menacing formality, declared them no longer servants to the prince of darkness, but of God. For, after the opinion had become prevalent among Christians, that rational souls originated from God himself, and therefore were in themselves holy, pure, and morally free, the evil propensities of man must be considered as arising from the body and from matter, or some evil spirit must be supposed to possess the souls of men and impel them to sin. The Gnostics all embraced the first supposition; but the catholics could in no wise embrace it, because they held that matter was created by God, and was not eternal. They had, therefore, to embrace the second supposition, and to imagine some evil demon, the author of sin and of all evil, to be resident in all vicious persons.² The persons baptized, returned home decorated with a crown and a white robe; the first being indicative of their victory over the world and their lusts, the latter, of their acquired innocence.³

§ 5. Greater sanctity and necessity than heretofore, were now attributed to *fasting*; because it was the general belief that demons laid fewer snares for such as lived abstemiously and hardly, than for the full-fed and luxurious.⁴ The Latins were singular in keeping every seventh day of the week as a fast;⁵ and as the Greek and Oriental Christians would not imitate them in this, it afforded abundant matter for altercation between the two. Ordinarily, Christians *prayed* three times a day, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours,⁶ as was the custom of the Jews. Besides these regular hours of prayer, they prayed much and often; for they considered it the highest duty of a holy man to hold converse with God. On joyful and festive occasions, when giving thanks to God, they thought it suitable to pray standing, thus expressing their joy and confidence by the posture of their bodies. But on sorrowful occasions and seasons of fasting and humiliation, they were accustomed to make their supplications on their bended knees or prostrate, to indicate self-abasement.⁷ That certain *forms of prayer* were everywhere used, both in public and in private, I have no doubt;⁸ but I am likewise confident that many

¹ [Cent. ii. pt. ii. c. 4, § 13. *Tr.*]

² That *exorcism* was not annexed to baptism, till some time in the *third* century, and after the admission of the Platonic philosophy into the church, may almost be demonstrated. The ceremonies used at baptism, in the *second* century, are described by Justin Martyr, in his second *Apology*, and by Tertullian, in his book *de Corona militis*. But neither makes any mention of exorcism. This is a cogent argument, to prove that it was admitted by Christians after the times of these fathers, and of course in the *third* century. Egypt perhaps first received it.

³ [Perhaps also of their *freedom*. — See note, Cent. ii. pt. ii. c. 4, § 6. Cyprian

refers to the *white garments*; *de Lapsis*, p. 181. *Schl.*]

⁴ *Clementina*, Homil. ix. § 9, p. 688, &c. Porphry, *de Abstinencia*, lib. iv. p. 417, &c. and others.

⁵ [See *Concilium Eliberitanum*, Canon 26. *Schl.*]

⁶ [9 A. M., 12 noon, and 3 P. M. *Tr.*]

⁷ [See Cyprian, *de Oratione*, p. 214; and *Constitut. Apostol.* ii. 59. *Schl.*]

⁸ [In the earliest times, exclusive of the short introductory salutation, *Pax vobiscum*, &c., no established forms of prayer were used in public worship, but the bishop or presbyter poured forth extempore prayers. See Justin Martyr, *Apology* ii. The Lord's prayer was used, not only as a pattern, but

persons poured out the feelings of their hearts before God in free and unpremeditated effusions. They thought the *sign of the cross* very efficacious against all sorts of evils, and particularly against the machinations of evil spirits; and, therefore, no one undertook anything of much moment, without first crossing himself.¹ Other ceremonies I pass by without notice.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF DIVISIONS AND HERESIES IN THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Remains of the ancient sects—§ 2. Manes and the Manichæans—§ 3. His principles—§ 4. His doctrine concerning man—§ 5. Concerning the nature of Christ and of the Holy Spirit—§ 6. Concerning the offices of Christ and the Comforter—§ 7. Concerning the purification and future condition of souls—§ 8. Concerning the state of souls not purified—§ 9. His opinion of the Old and New Testaments—§ 10. The severity of his moral principles, and the classification of his followers—§ 11. The sect of the Hieracites—§ 12. The Noëtian controversy—§ 13. Sabellius—§ 14. Beryllus—§ 15. Paul of Samosata—§ 16. Disturbances in Arabia—§ 17. Novatian controversy—§ 18. Severities of the Novatians towards the lapsed.

§ 1. Most of the sects which disquieted the church in the preceding centuries, caused it various troubles also in this. For the energies of the Montanists, Valentinians, Marcionites, and other Gnostics, were not wholly subdued by the numerous discussions of their tenets. *Adelphius* and *Aquilinus*, of the Gnostic tribe, but very little known, endeavoured to insinuate themselves and their doctrines into the esteem of the public at Rome and in Italy.² But these men, and others of the same kind, were resisted not only by *Plotinus* himself, the chief of the Platonists of this age, but also by his disciples, with

also as a formula of prayer. Yet only the baptized, and not the catechumens, might utter it. Tertullian, *de Oratione*, c. 1, 9. Cyprian; *de Oratione Domini*, *Constitut. Apostol.* vii. 44. Afterwards various forms were gradually introduced, and particularly of short prayers, derived from passages of Scripture. When greater uniformity in the churches as to ceremonies was introduced, the smaller churches had to regulate their forms of prayer conformably to those of the larger churches, and of course to adopt the formulas of the metropolitan churches. Origen, *contra Celsum*, vi.; and *Homilia in Jerem.* Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini Mag.* iv. 19, 20, 17. *H. E.* ii. 17. Lactantius, *de Morte Persecutor.* c. 46, 47. See Baumgarten's *Erläuterung der christlichen Alterthümer*, p. 432. *Schl.*—Blunt, *Hist. Chr. Ch.* p. 22, says that the evidences of the existence of a set service in the sub-aposto-

lical church are unquestionable. *Ed.*]

¹ [The Christians at first used the sign of the cross to bring to remembrance the atoning death of Christ, on all occasions. Hence Tertullian, *de Corona militis*, c. 3, p. 121, says: *Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad vestitum, ad calciatum, ad lavaera, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quæcunque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus*: also *ad Uxorem*, lib. ii. So late as the second century, the Christians paid it no adoration. See Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. 16; and *ad Nationes*, c. 12. But afterwards powerful efficacy began to be ascribed to it. See Cyprian, *Testimonia adv. Judæos*, ii. 21, 22, p. 294; and Lactantius, *Institut.* iv. 27, 28. *Schl.*—Minucius Felix, c. 29. Gieseler, ii. 36. *Ed.*]

² Porphyry, *Vita Plotini*, c. 16, p. 118, &c.

all the boldness and energy usual among orthodox believers. The philosophical opinions of this faction concerning God, the origin of the world, the nature of evil, and other subjects, could not, indeed, possibly be approved by Platonists. These united forces of Christians and philosophers were unquestionably strong enough to make the Gnostics gradually lose all credit and influence with discerning minds.¹

§ 2. While the Christians were struggling with these corruptors of the truth, and upon the point of gaining the victory,² a new enemy, more fierce and dangerous than any of them, suddenly appeared upon the field. *Manes*,³ whom his disciples commonly called also *Manichæus*,⁴ a Persian,⁵ educated among the Magi, and himself one of their body before he became a Christian, was instructed in all the sciences and arts generally esteemed by the Persians and adjacent nations; he was an astronomer (though a rude one), a physician, painter, and philosopher; but he had an exuberant imagination, and, most probably, a mind beside itself and fanatical. This man was bold enough to combine the principles of the Magi with Christianity, or rather to explain the latter by the former. To give this object a happier success, he gave out that *Christ* had left the way of salvation imperfectly explained, and that he himself was the *Paraclete* whom the Saviour promised to send to his disciples when he left the world. Many were seduced by his eloquence, his grave aspect, and the simplicity and innocence of his life; and in a short time he established a sect. But at last he was put to death by *Varanes I.*, king of the Persians. The cause, time, and manner of his execution, are variously stated by the ancients.⁶

¹ The book of Plotinus against the Gnostics, is still extant among his works. *Ennead.* ii. l. ix. p. 213, &c. [Semler, in his *Historie Eccles. Selecta Capita*, i. 81, conjectures, and not without reason, that the Gnostics, and all the assailants of the Old Testament, lost their power after Origen introduced the allegorical and tropological mode of expounding Scripture, and extended it in some measure to the history of Christ; and Dionysius Alex. and other learned fathers, e.g. Dorotheus, a presbyter of Antioch (who understood the Hebrew: Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 32), carried investigation farther, and more lucidly confuted the Jewish notions, at the same time approximating a little towards the Gnostic doctrines concerning the Son of God. Hence we hear no more about the Gnostics in this century; and the few who still remained, joined the Manichæans. *Schl.*]

² [A little past the middle of this century. *Tr.*]

³ [The oriental writers call him *Mani* (Hyde, *de Reliq. vet. Persarum*, c. 21, and D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, art. *Mani*); but the Greeks and Latins call him

Mārys, *Māveys*, and *Manes*. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 691. *Schl.*]

⁴ [See the *Acta Archelai*, c. 5. 49. Augustine, *de Hæresib.* c. 46, and *contra Faustum*, xix. 22. *Schl.*]

⁵ [Notwithstanding the Greek and Oriental writers represent *Manes* as a Persian, Walch (*Hist. Ketz.* i. 708) and Beausobre (*Hist. Crit. de Manichée*, i. 66) think it more probable that he was a Chaldean; because Ephraim Syrus expressly so states, *Opp. Syro-Latin.* ii. 468; and Archelaus, in his *Acta cum Manete*, c. 36, charges *Manes* with understanding no language but that of the Chaldees. *Schl.*]

⁶ All that is extant concerning the life, the deeds, and the doctrines of this very singular genius, has been very carefully collected, and reviewed ingeniously — though often with more ingenuity and copiousness than were necessary — by Isaac de Beausobre, in his *Histoire Critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme*, Amsterdam, 1734—39, 2 vols. 4to. [Consult also Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 728—903; Jo. Christ. Wolf, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, &c. Hamb. 1707, 8vo; Nathaniel Lardner's

§ 3. The religious system of *Manes* is a compound of Christianity and the ancient philosophy of the Persians, which he had imbibed in

Credibility of the Gospel History, pt. ii. vol. iii. p. 364—753; and Walch's *Hist. Ketz.* i. 685—814. The last of these works concentrates, arranges properly, and criticises acutely and solidly, all that has been said on the subject by Wolf, Beausobre, Mosheim, and Lardner. Von Einem.—The original sources, according to Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 729, &c. are, besides the ancient historical writers, Epiphanius, Augustine, Eusebius, Theodoret, Damascenus, and Philastrius.—I. What remains of the writings of Manes himself and his followers; viz. (a) *Manetis Epistola Fundamenti*, in Augustine, *contra Ep. Fundamenti*; (b) a fragment of his *Sermo de Fide*, in Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lvi. 14; (c) his *Epistola ad Marcellum* in the *Acta Archelai cum Manete*, p. 6, ed. Zaccag.; (d) some fragments of his *Epistola ad Menoch*, in Augustine, *adv. Julianum Pelagian.*; (e) several extracts from his Epistles, in J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* v. 284; (f) *Acta disputationis Archelai, Episc. Mesopot. cum Manete*, inter *Collectanea Monumentor. veteris Eccles. Græcæ et Latinæ*, published by L. A. Zaccagnius, Rome, 1698, 4to; also, inter *Opp. Hippolyti*, vol. ii. ed. Fabricii (the genuineness of these *Acta* is questioned by Beausobre, but without good reason); (g) many quotations from Faustus the Manichæan, in Augustine's thirty-three books *contra Faustum Manichæum*; (h) various statements of his antagonists, contained in Augustine's two books, *de Actis cum Felice Manichæo*; and in his book *contra Fortunatum Manichæum*. II. The writings of the fathers, who attempted to confute Manes and his followers; viz. (a) Augustine, *de Hæresibus*, and in the works above mentioned (I. a, g, and h); (b) Titus of Bostra, lib. iii. *contra Manichæos*, Gr. and Lat. inter *Lectiones Antiquas*, ed. Canisii; et denuo, J. Basnagii, i. 156, &c.; (c) Didymus Alexandrinus, *Liber contra Manichæos*, Gr. and Lat. in the same *Lectiones Antiq.* i. 197; (d) Alexander Lycopolitanus, the philosopher, *Liber contra Manichæi opiniones*, Gr. and Lat. in the *Auctuarium noviss. Biblioth. Patr.* ed. Combefis, ii. 260. *Tr.*—In regard to the history of Manes, there is much disagreement between the oriental and the Grecian writers. Yet in the particulars stated in the text, there is no disagreement. We will extract from Mosheim's *Commentaries*, p. 734, &c., so much as is necessary to give a full history of this extraordinary man. Manes, on meeting with the books of the Christians, found that the religion which they contained, coincided with his philosophy in some respects, and contradicted it

in others. He determined to unite the two together, to enlarge and improve the one by the other, and thus to give the world a new religion. He began by giving out that he was the Paraclete, and perhaps he really supposed himself so. But he was not so deranged and carried away by his imagination, as to be unable to frame a consistent system, and to discover what would tend to confirm it, and what to weaken it. He therefore rejected or altered such books of the Christians as contravened his opinions, and substituted others in their places, particularly those which he pretended were written by himself under a divine impulse. The king of Persia threw him into prison, but for what cause is unknown. The Greek writers (especially Archelaus, in his *Acta cum Manete*, who furnished the other Greek and Latin writers with nearly all the historical facts they state) represent that he was imprisoned, because, having promised to cure the king's son, he failed, and caused the death of the young prince. A different account is given by the oriental writers (Persian, Syrian, and Arabian, cited by D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orient.* art. *Mani*; Tho. Hyde, *Historia Reliq. veter. Persarum*, c. 21; Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.* p. 42; Edw. Pocock, *Specimen Hist. Arabum*, p. 149, &c.) They state that Manes, coming to the court of king Sapor, was received kindly, and that his doctrines were embraced by the monarch. Hereupon Manes became so bold as publicly to attack the Persian religion. This drew on him persecution, and so endangered his life, that he was obliged to flee into Turkistan. Here he collected many followers, and spent a whole year in a cave, where he composed his book entitled *Erteng or Arzeug*, i.e. *the Gospel*, and which is adorned with splendid paintings. This book he represented to be a gift of God. In the meantime Sapor died, and was succeeded by his son Hormisdas, who was so favourable to Manes, as to embrace his religion, and to allow him to build a castle, in which he might be safe from all plots. Perhaps Hormisdas was a favourer of Manes, in the lifetime of his father. And Dr. Mosheim conjectures (*Comment. &c.* p. 739) that the Grecian story of his fatal attempt to cure the king's son, was an oriental allegory, which the Greeks construed literally; that the disease was ignorance, the medicine instruction, the physician the teacher, and the death of the patient his apostasy from the religion of his progenitors: [all which is very improbable, and indeed inconsistent; for the king, having himself embraced the doctrine of Manes, would not

early life.¹ What the Persians relate concerning their *Mithras*, Manes applied to *Christ*. According to his views and those of the Persians, there are two first principles of all things, a subtle and very pure substance, or *light*, and a gross and corrupt substance, or *darkness*. Over each of these a Lord has reigned from all eternity. The Lord of *light* is denominated *God*; the regent of the *world of darkness* is called *Hyle*,² or *dæmon*.³ These two Lords are of opposite natures and dispositions. The Lord of *light*, as he is himself happy, so he is beneficent; the Lord of *darkness*, being himself miserable, wishes others also to be miserable, and is malignant. Each has produced a numerous progeny of his own peculiar character, and distributed them over his empire.

§ 4. For an immense time, the Prince of darkness did not know that light and a land of it existed. But some war that arose in his kingdom brought it under his notice, and he immediately became eager to get possession of it. The Lord of light opposed him with an army; but the general of this celestial army, whose name was *The first Man*, was rather unsuccessful; and the troops of darkness seized a considerable portion, not only of the celestial elements, but also of light itself, which is an animate substance; and these they mixed with depraved matter. Another general from the world of light, called *The living Spirit*, warred more successfully; but could not free the celestial substance from its combination with the vicious elements. The vanquished Prince of darkness produced the parents of the human race. The men who are born of this stock consist of a body formed from the depraved matter of the world of darkness, and of two souls, the one sensitive and concupiscent, which they derived

have imprisoned him for converting his son to the same religion.] After the death of Hormisdas, Varanes I. succeeded to the throne. He was at first well disposed towards Manes, but soon turned against him, and determined on his destruction. For this purpose he allured him from his safe retreat, under pretence of a disputation with the Magi, and caused him to be put to death as a perverter of the true religion. This took place in the year 278; or, according to Walch (*Hist. Ketz.* i. 724), in 277. The shocking fate of Manes rather animated than terrified his followers. The most able and eloquent of them roamed through Syria, Persia, Egypt, Africa, and over most parts of the world; and by the severity of their morals, and the simplicity of their religion, everywhere made proselytes. And, notwithstanding all the persecutions that have befallen them, their descendants exist to this day, in the mountains between Persia and India. *Schl.*]

¹ [When Mani appeared, an anxiety prevailed in Persia to re-establish the pure doctrine of Zoroaster; but, from obscurity in documents, it was not found easy to ascertain exactly what that doctrine was.

Mani maintained its identity with Christianity freed from Jewish adulterations. He thus produced a new form of Gnosticism; one chiefly distinguished from its predecessors, by wanting those portions of them which came from Jewish theology and Platonic philosophy. He did not, however, take up a theory that was undisputed in Persia. The religious authorities of that country were divided as to the origin of all things. Some of them maintained that one Supreme Being had existed from all eternity, from whom, therefore, were derived both *Ormuzd*, the good principle, or lord of light, and *Ahriman*, the bad principle, or lord of darkness. This hypothesis made *Ahriman* to have been originally a good being, but now a fallen one. Other Persian divines considered *Ormuzd* and *Ahriman* as two self-existent beings, opposed from all eternity to each other. This was the doctrine of the Magusiæ sect, to which Mani belonged. He represented, therefore, the opposition between light and darkness as absolute and irreconcilable. See Rose's *Neander*, ii. 140. *S.*]

² [*Τλῆν*, matter. *Tr.*]

³ [The devil. *Tr.*]

from the Prince of darkness, the other rational and immortal, which is a particle of the divine light plundered by the army of darkness and immersed in matter.

§ 5. Men being thus formed by the Prince of darkness, and minds, which were the daughters of eternal light, being enclosed in their bodies, God now, by the *living Spirit*, who had before vanquished the Prince of darkness, formed this our earth out of vicious matter, that it might become the residence of the human race, and might afford God advantages for gradually delivering souls from their bodies, and separating the good matter from the bad. Afterwards God produced from himself two *majestic beings*, who should afford succour to the souls immured in bodies; namely, *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*. *Christ* is the being whom the Persians call *Mithras*: he is a most splendid substance, consisting of the purest light of God, self-existent, animate, excelling in wisdom, and having his residence in the sun. The *Holy Spirit* likewise is an animate and lucid substance, which is diffused through the whole atmosphere that encompasses our earth, warms and enlightens the souls of men, fecundates the earth, elicits gradually from it the latent particles of divine fire, and wafts them upward, that they may return to their native world.

§ 6. After God had, for a long time, admonished the captive souls immured in bodies, by angels and by men instructed by himself, he at length, in order to accelerate their return to the heavenly country, directed *Christ*, his son, to descend from the sun to this our world. He being clad in the form and shadow of a human body, but not joined to a real body, appeared among the Jews, pointed out the way in which souls may extricate themselves from the body, and proved his divinity¹ by his miracles. But the Prince of darkness instigated the Jews to crucify him. This punishment, however, he did not endure in reality, from his want of a body, but only in popular apprehension. Having accomplished his embassy, *Christ* returned to his home, the sun, first charging the apostles to propagate the religion that he had taught them throughout the world. Moreover, when departing, he promised to send, at a certain time, a greater and more perfect apostle, whom he called the *Paraclete*, who should make many additions to his precepts, and remove all errors from religious subjects. This *Paraclete*, promised by *Christ*, was *Manes* the Persian, who, by command of God, explained the whole doctrine of salvation perfectly, and without reserve of any kind.

§ 7. Such souls as believe *Jesus Christ* to be the son of God, renounce the worship of the God of the Jews (who is no other than the Prince of darkness), obey the laws given by *Christ*, but enlarged and explained by *Manes*, the *Paraclete*, and perseveringly resist the

¹ [Not his *Divinity*: for this, in the true and proper sense of the word, the Manichæans could not predicate of Christ, nor of the Holy Ghost. They held neither of them to be more ancient than the world. See Fortunatus, in his dispute with Augustine,

i. p. 69. They believed that the *light* of the *Son* might be obscured by intervening matter, but that the *light* of the *Father* could not. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 775, &c. *Schl.*]

lusts of the evil soul; hence they are purified by degrees from the contaminations of vicious matter. Yet the entire purgation of souls cannot be effected in the present life. Therefore, souls, when freed from the body, have still to undergo a twofold purification, after death, before they are admitted into the world of light; first by sacred *water*, secondly by sacred *fire*. They first go to the *moon*, which consists of sacred *water*; and in that they are purified during fifteen days; thence they proceed to the *sun*, the holy *fire* of which removes entirely all their remaining pollution. The bodies which they left behind, being formed of base matter, return to their original.

§ 8. But souls which have neglected their purgation, will, after death, pass into new bodies, either of animals or of other beings, until expiation shall be made. Some also, being peculiarly depraved, will be delivered over to the evil demons inhabiting our atmosphere, to be tormented for a season. When the greater part of the souls shall be liberated and restored to the world of light, then, at the command of God, infernal fire will burst from the caverns in which it is contained, and will burn up and destroy the fabric of this world. After these events, the powers of darkness will be compelled to retire to their wretched country, and must remain for ever there. For, lest by chance they should make war again upon the territories of light, God will encompass the world of darkness with an invincible guard. This will be composed of souls irrecoverably lost, which will keep watch like soldiers about the world of darkness, so that its miserable inhabitants can go out no more.

§ 9. To give these monstrous opinions some plausibility, *Manes* rejected nearly all the sacred books in which Christians think their religion to be contained. The *Old Testament*, especially, he pronounced to be the work, not of God, but of the Prince of darkness, whom he represented the Jews as worshipping in place of the true God. The four histories of *Christ*, which we call *Gospels*, he either denied to have been composed by the apostles, or he maintained that if they were so, they had been corrupted, interpolated, and amplified with Jewish fables by crafty and mendacious men. In place of them he substituted another Gospel which he denominated *Erteng*, and which he affirmed had been dictated to him by God himself.¹ The *Acts of the Apostles* he wholly rejected. The *Epistles*, which are ascribed to *St. Paul*, he admitted to have been written by him, but maintained that they were adulterated. What he thought of the other books of the New Testament, we are not informed.

§ 10. The rules of life which *Manes* prescribed for his followers, were peculiarly rigorous and severe. For he bade them enervate the body, which he regarded as evil in itself, and the work of the

¹ [‘He remained for a time in the province of Turkistan, and prepared there a series of beautiful pictures, which contained a symbolical representation of his doctrine,—the book which was named by the Persians, *Ertengi*—*Mani*. It may probably have happened that he withdrew into solitude, in

order to receive the revelations of God, as he declared that he derived these images (which represented his conceptions) amidst calm reflexion, in a cavern, and maintained that he received them in his mind from heaven.’ *Rose’s Neander*, ii. 146. S.]

Prince of darkness; deprive it of every convenience and gratification; extirpate every sensual appetite; strip off all the lusts and instincts of nature. But as he foresaw that he could expect few to embrace his system, if he imposed upon all, without discrimination, such severe rules of life, he divided his followers into two classes, the *elect* and the *hearers*; that is, the *perfect* Christians and the *imperfect*.¹ The former, or the *elect*, were to abstain from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, and every inebriating drink, from marriage, and from every indulgence of sexual passions, to live in the most abject poverty, to sustain their emaciated bodies with bread, herbs, pulse, and melons, to abstain from all active life, and to be devoid both of love and hatred. A milder rule was prescribed for the *hearers*. They might possess houses, lands, and goods, eat flesh, though sparingly, and marry wives: yet even these indulgences had their limitations. Over the whole body of the Manichæans a single individual presided, who represented *Jesus Christ* himself; with him were connected twelve *masters*, or rulers, who represented the twelve apostles; next to these there were seventy-two *bishops*, corresponding with the seventy-two disciples of Christ; and under each bishop there were *presbyters* and *deacons*. All these officers were from the class of the *elect*.²

§ 11. The sect of the *Hieracites* was formed in Egypt, near the close of this century, by *Hierax*³ of Leontopolis, a transcriber of books by profession,⁴ but a man of learning, and venerable for conspicuous sanctity of deportment. Many have supposed that this sect was a branch of the Manichæan family, but erroneously; for although *Hierax* held some notions in common with *Manes*, yet he differed

¹ [The *elect* were also called the *faithful*, or *believers*; and the *hearers* were called *catechumens*. The former were either *baptized* or *unbaptized*. If baptized, they could not change their condition; if unbaptized, they might return to the class of *hearers*, if they found themselves unable to endure the rigorous discipline of the perfect. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* §c. p. 896, &c. Schl.]

² All these particulars are more fully stated, and supported by citations from antiquity, in my *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* §c. [p. 728—903; with which compare Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 685—814. From both, we extract the following notices, respecting the *worship* of this sect. They revered the sun and the moon, though not as deities. Their worship was so simple, that they claimed to be farther removed from paganism than all other Christians. They had no temples, altars, images, oblations, or burning of incense. They observed Sundays, as fasts, but none of the Christian festivals which relate to the incarnation and baptism of Christ. They celebrated the memorial of Christ's death, but with little devotion. Whether they observed Easter, is uncertain. But they observed the anni-

versary of *Manes*' death, which they called *Bama*, with great devotion. *Fasting* was one of their most important religious exercises. They kept sacred Sundays and Mondays. They did not baptize either children, or grown persons who were only *hearers*; and even to the *elect*, it was left optional, whether they would be baptized or not. The *elect* observed likewise the *Lord's Supper*; though it is not known what they used in place of wine, which was with them altogether prohibited. Schl.—The *elect* were, therefore, in a manner, 'the Brahmins of the Manichees;' and Faustus, as quoted by Augustine, calls them *sacerdotale genus*. Like, also, the Brahminical devotees of India, they were not to wound or kill any animal. They were 'not even to pull any vegetable, nor to pluck any fruit or flower.' Rose's *Neander*, ii. 165. S.]

³ [Otherwise called *Hieracas*. S.]

⁴ ['According to the practice of ascetics, he procured for himself what was necessary for his livelihood, and means for the exercise of his benevolence, by an art which was much prized, and much used in Egypt, that of *fine penmanship*, in which he was skilful, both as regarded the Greek and the Coptic characters.' Rose's *Neander*, ii. 404. S.]

from him in many respects. He believed *Christ's* great business to have been the promulgation of a *new law*, more perfect and severe than that of *Moses*. Hence he made him to have restrained his followers from marriage, flesh, wine, and all things grateful to the senses and the body: so that indulgences which *Moses* gave, were taken away by *Jesus*. Yet if we duly consider all accounts, it will seem that *Hierax*, like *Manes*, did not consider these hard injunctions as imposed by *Christ* on *all*, but only on such as aimed at virtue of the higher kind. To this radical error he added others, either growing out of it, or derived elsewhere. For example, he excluded infants, who died before they came to the use of reason, from the kingdom of heaven; because divine rewards could be due to none but such as had actually passed through regular conflicts with the body and its lusts. He also maintained, that *Melchisedec*, the king of Salem who blessed Abraham, was the *Holy Spirit*. The resurrection of the body he denied: and the whole sacred volume, and especially its historical parts, he obscured with allegorical interpretations.¹

§ 12. The controversies respecting the divine *Trinity*, which commenced in the preceding century, from the time when Grecian philosophy got into the church, had a wider spread in this century, and produced various methods of explaining that doctrine. First,² *Noëtus*, a man of whom little is known, a native of Smyrna, maintained that *God* himself, whom he denominated the *Father*, and held to be absolutely *one and indivisible*, united himself with the man *Christ*, whom he called the *Son*; and, in him, was born and suffered. From this dogma of *Noëtus*, his adherents were called *Patripassians*; *i. e.* persons who held that the great *Parent* of the universe himself, and not some *one person* of the Godhead, had made expiation for the sins of men. Nor were they unfitly denominated so, if the ancients correctly understood their views.³

¹ Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxvii. [and Augustine, *Hæresib.* c. 47], from whom nearly all others have borrowed, with little exception, all they state. [See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* §c. p. 903—910. Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 815—823. Tillemont, *Mém.* t. iv. 411; and Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel Hist.* pt. ii. vol. vi. p. 76, &c. *Schl.*]

² [In the early part of the century. *Tr.*]

³ See Hippolytus, *Sermo contra Hæresin Noëti*, in his *Opp.* ii. 5, ed. Fabricii; Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lvii. *Opp.* i. 479; Theodoret, *Hæret. Fabul.* iii. 3. *Opp.* iv. 227.—[*Noëtus* so held the *unity* of *God*, as to discard the orthodox opinion of a plurality of persons in the Godhead. In fact, he acknowledged but *one person*; who is designated in the Scriptures by the title of the *Father*. *Noëtus* therefore was a Unitarian, as respects the doctrine of *three persons*; but in regard to the character of *Christ*, he held better views than the Socinians. So

far as relates to two natures united in one person in *Christ*, he agreed with the orthodox; but the divine person, which was united with the human nature, according to *Noëtus'* views, was no other than the person of the *Father*, because there was no other person in the Godhead. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* p. 681—687; and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 1—13. *Schl.*—*Noëtus* was a Smyrnan; cf. *fl.* c. 200. A pupil of his, Epigonus, went to Rome, and there converted Cleomenes to the new heresy. Cleomenes infected pope Zephyrinus and Callistus, who succeeded him. Callistus, on becoming pope, cast off Sabellius, with whom also he had been implicated, and set up a school of Callistians, who combined the heresy of *Noëtus* with relaxation of moral principles. Hippolytus appears to have been a determined enemy of the whole party. See Wordsworth, *Hippolytus*, p. 227, 314. Robertson, i. 82. *Ed.*]

§ 13. Like opinions, when half the century had passed, were maintained by *Sabellius*, an African, either presbyter or bishop, at Ptolemais, the principal city in Pentapolis, a province of Libya Cyrenaica. He explained what the Scriptures teach concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in a manner somewhat different from *Noëtus*; and found followers, although he was confuted by *Dionysius* of Alexandria. *Noëtus* had supposed that God the Father *personally* assumed the human nature of Christ; but *Sabellius* held that only a certain *energy*, put forth by the supreme Parent, or a certain *portion* of the divine nature being separated from it, became united with the *Son*, or the man *Christ*. The *Holy Spirit* he considered as a similar portion or part of the eternal Father.¹ Hence it appears,

¹ Most of the ancients who wrote against the heretics, speak of Sabellius; [especially Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxi.; and Theodoret, *Hæret. Fabul.* ii. 9.] To these, add Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 6. Athanasius, *de Sententia Dionysii*; [and Basil the Great, *Ep.* 210, and 235.] Nearly all that is written by the ancients has been collected by Christopher Wormius, in his *Historia Sabelliana*, Francf. and Lips. 1696, 8vo, a learned work, only a small part of which relates to Sabellius. [See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* §c. p. 688—699. (Beausobre, *Hist. de Manichée*, §c. i. 533, &c. N. Lardner, *Credibility of the Gosp. Hist.* pt. ii. vol. iv. p. 558, &c.) and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 14—49. The last of these differs somewhat from Mosheim, in his description of the Sabellian doctrine. We place the two accounts side by side, without attempting to decide so difficult a question. The most common opinion respecting the Sabellian doctrine, was this: Sabellius admitted but *one person* in the Divine essence; or he denied that the Father was one person, the Son another person, and the Holy Spirit a third; of course he discarded the inherent distinction of three persons. He admitted a difference only of *names*, and of some external *relations* to creatures, in regard to the government of the world and of the church; and he ascribed to the Son those works which we regard as the personal acts of the Father; and on the other hand, he ascribed to the Father the acts and the sufferings of the Son. Now Dr. Mosheim concedes, that Sabellius taught there was but *one divine person*; but he maintains also, that Sabellius admitted a *Trinity*, and a real *difference* between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; though this difference was neither an essential, nor a personal one; the divine *three* were not three distinct *persons*, but three *portions* of the divine nature, all depending on God, and at the same time differing from God, and from each other. That portion, by which God made the world, is the Father; and is also the Father of

Christ, inasmuch as it formed Him in the womb of Mary. That portion, which united itself with the man Christ, in order to redeem men, is the Son; inasmuch as it dwelt in the Son of God (a designation which refers to his miraculous conception), and by him gave instruction, wrought miracles, and, in a sense, made one person with him. The third portion of the divine nature, which imparts life to all living beings, enlightens men, regenerates them, and prompts them to what is good, is the Holy Ghost. These three are, in one view, separate from God; but in another, they are united with Him. After a critical examination of the correctness of this scheme, Dr. Walch cannot fully accord with the views of Mosheim. He therefore states the doctrine of Sabellius thus: the ancients, one and all, say, that the Sabellian system marred the true doctrine concerning God, and concerning all the three persons. And so it appears to be proved, by the ancients, that Sabellianism was one of two directly opposite errors, of which Arianism was the other; and that the true doctrine occupied the middle ground between them: indeed Arius, by pushing his opposition to Sabellius too far, was led into his error. It hence follows, that Sabellius, who did not deny the existence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, made too little distinction between them; while Arius made the distinction too wide. It is clear, that Sabellius acknowledged but *one person*, and considered the Son of God as not being a *distinct* person: so that he could not have taught a *personal* distinction in the Trinity. By the *Word* (*Λόγος*), Sabellius understood an *energy*, by which the man Christ performed his works. So long as Christ remained on earth, this divine energy was in him; but afterwards it ceased. It was therefore like a sunbeam, which operates on bodies and produces the effects of the sun, without being itself a person. So also is it with the Holy Ghost, by which we are to understand the *operations* of God in men, tending to further their

that the *Sabellians* must have been denominated by the ancients *Patripassians*, in a different sense of the word from that in which the *Noëtians* were so called. Yet the appellation was not wholly improper.

§ 14. Nearly at the same time, *Beryllus*, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, a pious and learned man, taught that *Christ*, before he was born of the Virgin, had no distinct divinity, but only that of the *Father*. This proposition, if we duly consider what is reported concerning him by the ancients, amounts to this, that *Christ* had no existence before he was born of Mary; that, at his birth, a *soul*, sprung from God himself, and consequently superior to the souls of all men, as being actually a particle of the divine nature, entered into him, and was united with the man. *Beryllus* was so lucidly and energetically confuted by *Origen*, in a council assembled at Bostra,¹ that he gave up the cause, and returned into the bosom of the church.²

knowledge of the truth and their advancement in virtue. The manner of God's putting forth his energy, by which the Son was produced, and by which the Holy Ghost is still produced and continued, the ancients expressed by the words, to spread out, or extend (*παρατείνεσθαι*, protendere, extendere), to send forth (*πέμπεσθαι*), and to transform, or change one's form and appearance (*μεταμορφείσθαι*, μετασχηματίζειν). From what has now been stated, it may be perceived how Sabellius could have taught the existence of three forms or aspects (*τρία πρόσωπα*) in the divine essence, without admitting the reality of three different persons; and how his opposers could infer, that he admitted but one distinction under three different names. The greatest difficulty is in this, that according to some representations, Sabellius taught there was a difference or separation (*διαίρεσις*) between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but according to other accounts, he maintained such a unity as was inconsistent with it. This difficulty is the most easily surmounted, by supposing the former to refer to an imagined or conceived distinction, and not any real one. Such are Dr. Walch's views of the Sabellian system; [and very similar are those of Dr. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. pt. ii. p. 1018—1025. Tr.—Dr. Walch thinks that Sabellius ought not to be called a *Patripassian*; for these held Christ to be one person, in whom two natures were personally united; and believed that, not the divine nature of the Son, as a person, but the divine nature of the Father, who was the only person, was united with the human nature in Christ. Now as Sabellius held the Son to be no real part of the Father, and still less held to a personal union of two natures in Christ, he cannot truly be called a *Patripassian*. According to Sabellius' opinion, Christ was a mere

man, in whom resided a divine power, that produced those effects which we regard as the acts of the divine nature united to the human. Among the opposers of Sabellius, Dionysius of Alexandria attracted the most notice. Yet the opposition made by this bishop was not satisfactory to all. Offensive passages were found in his epistles against the Sabellians. As he there brought forward the doctrine of Christ's incarnation, and from that deduced his proof of the real distinction between the Father and the Son, he was understood as holding that the Son, in so far as he was a divine being, was a created one, or as denying that the Father and the Son were of the same essence. Dionysius defended himself, and showed that he had been misunderstood. Notwithstanding this, the Arians, after his death, claimed him as on their side, which obliged Athanasius to vindicate the reputation of Dionysius against them. Still there continued to be some to whom this defence appeared insufficient; Basil the Great is an example. There can be no doubt that Dionysius thought with Athanasius in regard to the Trinity, but he used the language of Arius. In regard to the person of Christ, he expressed himself in the manner of Nestorius; for he carried the distinction between the divine and the human natures of Christ so far, as wholly to exclude the former from a participation in those changes in the latter which were the result of the personal union of the two natures. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. p. 50—63. Schl.]

¹ [A.D. 244. Tr.]

² Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 20, 33. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 60. Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 7. Among the moderns, see Jo. Le Clerc, *Ars Critica*, vol. i. pt. ii. sec. i. c. 14. Chaufepied, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit.* i. 268, &c. [See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 699, &c. and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii.

§ 15. Very different from him, both in morals and in sentiment, was *Paul* of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, and at the same time clothed with the civil office of a *ducenarius*.¹ He was a man fickle, wealthy, and arrogant,² whose novel explanation of the doctrine upon the divine nature and *Christ*, greatly disquieted the eastern church, soon after the middle of this century. The sect which embraced his opinions, were called *Paulians* or *Paulianists*. So far as can be judged from the accounts that have reached us, he supposed the Son and the Holy Spirit to exist in God, just as reason and the operative power do in man; that *Christ* was born a mere man; but that the *wisdom* or *reason*³ of the Father descended into him and enabled him to teach and to work miracles; that on account of this union of the divine Word⁴ with the man *Christ*, we might say that *Christ* was *God*, though not in the proper sense of the term. He so concealed his real sentiments under ambiguous forms of speech, that repeated ecclesiastical councils were wholly unable to convict him; but at last, in a council assembled A. D. 269, *Malchion*, a rhetorician, drew him from his evasions. On this exposure he was divested of his episcopal office.⁵

126—136. Walch does not place Beryllus among the heretics; because he is not chargeable with obstinacy in his errors, nor with establishing a sect or party; both of which are necessary to constitute a heretic. Of his sentiments little is known, except that he maintained that Christ, before his incarnation, did not exist as a divine person; but that after his incarnation, he was a man in whom God, namely the Father, dwelt.—Mosheim's assertion, that Beryllus represented Christ as possessing a *soul* derived from the divine essence, is a mere conjecture that cannot be supported by proof. *Schl.*—Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. 1014, &c. places Beryllus among that class of Patripassians who considered the personality of the Son of God as originating from a *radiation* or *emanation* from the essence of God into a human body. He therefore places Beryllus and Sabellius in the same class. *Tr.*]

¹ [The *ducenarii* were a species of procurators for the emperors, in the provinces, whose salary was two hundred sesteritia, [*ducenta* sesteritia, equal to 1614*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.* *S.*] from which sum these officers derived their title. See *Dion Cassius*, lib. liii. *Suetonius*, *Claudian*, c. 24, and *Salmasius*, *Notes on Capitolinus*, *Pertinax*, p. 125. From *Seller's Antiquities of Palmyra*, Lond. 1696, 8vo, p. 166, &c. it appears, that this office was much used in the province of Syria, and Mosheim conjectures (*Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 705) that Paul obtained it by means of Zenobia, who had a high esteem for him. *Schl.*]

² Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 30. [Eusebius here gives copious extracts from the circular

letter of the council which condemned Paul, and ordained Domnus his successor. The council characterise Paul, as having risen from poverty to opulence, by extortion and bribery; as proud and insolent and ostentatious; as choosing to be addressed by his civil title, and appearing in public attended by guards and all the splendour of worldly rank; as affecting splendour and power, and abusing authority as an officer in the church; as intolerably vain, and coveting the adulations of the multitude; as decrying the fathers of the church, exalting himself, and abolishing the hymns in common use, and appointing women to sing psalms in praise of himself; as sending out bishops and presbyters to sound his praise, and to extol him as an angel from heaven; as keeping several young and handsome women near his person, whom he enriched with presents, and as living in luxury with them. *Tr.*]

³ [*Δόγος*. *Tr.*]

⁴ [*Δόγος*. *Tr.*]

⁵ See *Epistola Concilii Antiocheni ad Paulum*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, xi. 302, ed. Paris, 1644, fol. and *Dionysii Alexandrini Ep. ad Paulum*, *ibid.* p. 273, and *Decem Pauli Samosatani Questiones*, *ibid.* p. 278. [See also Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 701—718, and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 64—125. From the last writer, we extract the following: 1. Paul of Samosata taught that there is but *one* God, who in the Scriptures is denominated *the Father*. 2. He did not deny, that the Scriptures *speak* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 3. What he understood by the Holy Ghost, we do

§ 16. In a very different way, some minute philosophers in Arabia, disciples of a man unknown, marred a part of the Christian system. They denied the soul to be *immortal*; maintaining that it died with the body, and that it would be resuscitated with it by the power of God.¹ The believers in this doctrine were called *Arabians*, from the country in which they lived. Against them *Origen*, being sent for from Egypt, disputed with such success in a full council, that they renounced their error.

§ 17. Among the sects which arose in this century, I shall place the *Novatians* last. They did not, indeed, corrupt religion itself, but by the severity of the discipline to which they adhered a lamentable schism was produced. *Novatian*,² a presbyter in the church of Rome, a man of learning and eloquence, but stern and austere,³ maintained that such as had fallen into the more heinous sins, and especially such as had denied *Christ* during the Decian persecution, ought never to be received again into the church. Most of the other presbyters, as well as *Cornelius*, whose influence was very great, were of a different opinion. Hence, in the year 250, when a new bishop was to be chosen at Rome, in place of *Fabian*, *Novatian* strenuously opposed the election of *Cornelius*. He was nevertheless chosen, and *Novatian* withdrew from communion with him. On the other hand, *Cornelius*, in a council holden at Rome, A. D. 251, excommunicated *Novatian* and his adherents. *Novatian*, therefore, founded a new sect in which he was the first bishop. This sect had many adherents, who were pleased with the severity of its discipline; and it continued to flourish in many parts of Christendom until the fifth century. The principal coadjutor of *Novatian* in this schism

not know; and Mosheim has attempted to supply this defect by a mere conjecture. 4. Concerning the *Word* and the *Wisdom* of God, he has spoken largely: but whether he distinguished between the *Word in God* (Λόγος ἐνδιθετος) and the *Word produced from God* (Λόγος προφορικὸς), is doubtful. 5. This *Word* or *Wisdom* in God, is not a substance or a *person*. 6. But it is in the divine mind, as reason is in men. 7. Christ was a *mere man*. 8. He first began to exist, when he was born of Mary. 9. Yet in this man dwelt the divine *Word* or *Wisdom*; and it was operative in Him. 10. The union commenced, when Christ was conceived in the womb of Mary. 11. By means of this *Wisdom* of God in him, Christ gradually acquired his knowledge and his practical virtues. By it, he became at once *God* and the *Son of God*; yet both, in an improper sense of the terms.—From this account it appears, that Photinus, in the next age, came very near to Paul of Samosata, not indeed in his statements and expressions, but rather in his grand error, namely, that Christ was a mere man, and superior to other men only on account of his preëminent gifts. *Schl.*]

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 37. [See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 718, and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 167—171. As Eusebius, our only authority, gives a very brief account of this sect, the learned in modern times have entertained two opinions concerning their system. Some suppose that they held that the soul, though immaterial, *sleeps* while the body is in the grave; which, however, the words of Eusebius seem to contradict, for they describe the soul as *dying*, and *being dissolved with the body*, συναποβήσκειν τοῖς σώματι καὶ συνδιαφθίσεσθαι. Others suppose, more correctly, that they were Christian *materialists*, who regarded the soul as being a *part of the body*. And Mosheim conjectures, that their error originated from their combining the Epicurean philosophy with Christianity. *Schl.*]

² [The Greeks always write his name Novatus or Navatus: but the Latins generally write it Novatianus; perhaps to distinguish him from Novatus of Carthage, the names being really the same. *Tr.*]

³ [These traits of character he perhaps owed to the Stoic philosophy, to which some have supposed him addicted. See Walch, l. c. p. 195. *Schl.*]

was *Novatus*, a presbyter of Carthage, who fled to Rome during the heat of this controversy, in order to escape the anger and condemnation of *Cyprian*, his bishop, with whom he had a violent quarrel.¹

¹ [Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 220, &c., after surveying the original accounts, gives the following connected view of these events. A great number of those who, in the Decian persecution, had fallen from their steadfastness, having afterwards repented of their fall, and sought to be admitted again to communion, gave rise to the question of conscience, how they ought to be treated. The episcopal chair at Rome was at that time vacant, in consequence of the death of *Fabian*; and the clergy were divided in regard to this question, some advocating mild, and others more rigorous measures. Among the latter was *Novatian*, among the former *Cornelius*; both of them elders in the church of Rome. On the side of *Novatian* were several confessors; that is, persons who had endured various corporeal punishments during the persecution without denying the faith; and these were haughty and overbearing towards their fallen brethren. While this subject was in agitation at Rome, news came from Carthage, that the lapsed there would be received again, but only after enduring a long penance; though, if in imminent danger of death, and they desired it, they might be reunited to the church. And these principles were approved at Rome, in an epistle composed by *Novatian* (inter *Epistolæ Cypr.* ep. 31). Now came on the election of a bishop of Rome; and here the two parties were divided. *Novatian* solemnly declared that he did not desire the office; and *Cornelius* was chosen by a majority of the votes. But as *Cornelius* was one of the milder party, not only *Novatian*, but also the confessors, and several of the elders, were dissatisfied with his election; and, it would seem, separated themselves from him. About this time *Novatus* arrived from Carthage. He had fallen out with *Cyprian*, his bishop, and perhaps knew that *Cyprian* was a friend of *Cornelius*; but the former did not commit himself. *Cornelius* acquainted *Cyprian* with his election. Information had already reached Carthage, that *Cornelius* was not approved by all at Rome; and *Cyprian* did not venture at once to declare in his favour, but sent two African bishops, *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, to Rome, with a letter addressed, not to *Cornelius*, as bishop, but to the clergy there, and to the neighbouring bishops who were present at the election. The *Cornelian* party again stated, that his election was regular; and the African envoys, with two envoys from Rome who accompanied them home, affirmed the same thing. Hereupon *Cornelius* was recognised at Carthage as bishop of Rome. But at Rome the business

was not so easily settled. The dissatisfied party urged a new election; and *Novatus* and *Evaristus* were the most suitable persons to persuade *Novatian* to consent to receive ordination. Three bishops were drawn from some small towns in Italy, and by deception induced to perform this act, which was also performed at an unusual hour. *Novatian* appears to have reluctantly consented to it, but he afterwards endeavoured to support himself in office. He sent letters everywhere, and twice despatched envoys to Africa. These could get no hearing from *Cyprian* and his adherents, yet their mission was not without effect. In other countries, likewise, he found persons who considered his dissatisfaction with *Cornelius*, and with his conduct towards the lapsed, as being well founded. In the mean time *Cornelius* held a council at Rome, which approved of the milder principles of discipline. *Novatian* was present, and resisted those principles before the council; but he was excommunicated by it, together with his adherents. This caused his party to diminish, many of his friends choosing rather to be on the stronger side: and hence he was induced, when administering the sacrament of the supper to his followers, to make them promise not to forsake him. *Schl.*—The following account of the dissensions at Carthage is extracted from *Mosheim's Comment. de Rebus, &c.* § xiii. p. 497, &c. and § xiv. p. 503, &c. *Novatus*, a presbyter, before the Decian persecution, had disagreed with *Cyprian*, his bishop, and formed a party against him. According to the representations of his adversaries, *Novatus* was not only arrogant, factious, vain, and rash, but also chargeable with many offences and crimes. *Cyprian* therefore resolved to bring him to trial. The day was appointed; but the imperial edict [for the persecution] intervened; and as *Cyprian* was obliged to retire into concealment, *Novatus* continued safe in his office. While *Cyprian* was in retirement, and the African magistrates fiercely persecuting the Christians, these contests were suspended. But when the storm from without was past, and *Cyprian* was preparing to return, *Novatus*, fearing that the bishop would renew the prosecution, deemed it necessary to raise a party against the bishop, which would prevent his return, and deprive him of the power of doing him harm. By means of *Felicissimus*, therefore, whom he had made his deacon, contrary to the will of the bishop, *Novatus* alienated a part of the church from *Cyprian*. *Felicissimus*, aided by one *Augendus*, prevented the exe-

§ 18. Respecting the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, there was no disagreement between the *Novatians* and other Christians. Their peculiarity was that they would not receive into the church persons who, after being baptized, fell into the greater sins. They did not, however, exclude them from all hopes of eternal salvation. They considered the Christian church, therefore, as a society of innocent persons, who, from their entrance into it, had defiled themselves with no sin of any considerable magnitude; and hence it followed that all associations of Christians which opened the door for the return of gross offenders, were in their view unworthy of the name of true churches. And hence they assumed the appellation of *Cathari*, that is, the *pure*; and what was still more, they rebaptized such as came over to them from the Catholics. For such influence had the error which they embraced upon their own minds, that they believed the baptism of churches admitting the lapsed, quite impotent for conveying remission of sins.¹

cution of the plans of the bishop in regard to the poor. Many of the people came over to his party, and also five presbyters, who had long been at variance with Cyprian. This turbulent party were able to retard a little, but not to prevent, the return of Cyprian. After some delay, which prudence dictated, the bishop returned to Carthage; and having assembled a council on the subject, especially of the lapsed, punished the temerity of his adversaries, and excommunicated Felicissimus, with the five presbyters his associates. Novatus was not of the number, as he was absent, having fled to Rome as soon as he found Cyprian would come to Carthage. The excommunicated persons, despising the censure passed on them, instituted a new church at Carthage,

in opposition to Cyprian, and established as the bishop of it Fortunatus, one of the presbyters whom Cyprian had condemned. But the party had more resolution than ability, and the schism was probably extinguished not long after its birth; for no mention is made of its progress by any of the fathers. *Tr.*]

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 43. Cyprian, in various of his Epistles, as *Ep.* 49, 52, &c. Gabr. Albaspinæus, *Observat. Eccles.* lib. ii. c. 20, 21. Jos. Aug. Orsi, *de Criminum Capital. inter veteres Christ. Absolutione*, p. 254, &c. Steph. Kenckel, *de Hæresi Novatiana*, Argentor. 1651, 4to. [Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 512—537, and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 185—288. *Schl.*]

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
UNDER THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK II.

EMBRACING

EVENTS FROM CONSTANTINE THE GREAT

TO

CHARLES THE GREAT.

FOURTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS AND THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Peaceful state of Christians at the beginning of the century — § 2. Persecution of Diocletian — § 3. The causes and the severity of it — § 4. The Christian cause reduced to great extremities — § 5. Tranquillity restored on the accession of Constantine to supreme power — § 6. Defeat of Maxentius — § 7, 8. Different opinions concerning the faith of Constantine — § 9. The cross seen by him in the heavens — § 10. Persecution of Licinius — § 11. State of the church under the sons of Constantine the Great — § 12. Julian persecutes the Christians — § 13. His character — § 14. The Jews attempt to rebuild their temple in vain — § 15. State of the church after the death of Julian — § 16. Remains of the pagans — § 17. Efforts of the philosophers against Christianity — § 18. Injuries it received from them — § 19. Propagation of Christianity among the Armenians — § 20. The Abyssinians and Georgians — § 21. The Goths — § 22. The Gauls — § 23. The causes of so many revolutions — § 24. Severe persecutions in Persia.

§ 1. THAT I may not place asunder needlessly facts intimately connected with each other, I am determined to exhibit whatever of good or ill befell the Christians in this century, not separately, as heretofore, but conjointly, following as much as possible the order of time. When the century began, the Roman empire had four sovereigns; of whom two were superior to the others, and bore the title of *Augustus*; namely, *Diocletian*, and *Maximianus Herculius*: the two inferior sovereigns, who bore the title of *Cæsars*, were *Constantius Chlorus*, and *Galerius Maximianus*. Under these four [associated] emperors, the face of Christian affairs was tolerably happy.¹ *Diocletian*,

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. 1. [Eusebius here describes the prosperous state of the Christians, and their consequent security and vices. The imperial palaces were full of Christians, and no one hindered them from openly professing Christianity. From among them men were chosen to the offices of imperial councillors, provincial governors,

magistrates, and generals. The bishops and other clergy were held in honour, even by those who adhered to the old religion of the state. And the number of Christians was seen to be increasing daily. Hence in all the cities spacious buildings were erected for public worship, in which the people assembled without fear: and they had nothing

though superstitious, indulged no hatred towards the Christians.¹ *Constantius Chlorus*, following only the dictates of reason in matters of religion, was averse from the popular idolatry, and friendly to the Christians.² The pagan priests, therefore, from well-grounded fears, lest Christianity, to their great and lasting injury, should spread its triumph far and wide, endeavoured to excite *Diocletian*, whom they knew to be both timid and credulous, by means of feigned oracles and other impostures, to make war upon the Christians.³

§ 2. These artifices not succeeding very well, they made use of the other emperor, *Galerius Maximianus*, who was also son-in-law of *Diocletian*, to effect their purpose. This cruel man, who knew nothing but military matters, was impelled partly by natural inclination, partly by his mother, a most superstitious woman, and partly by the pagan priests, to work incessantly upon his father-in-law, till he obtained an edict from him at Nicomedia, in the year 303, by which the temples of the Christians were to be demolished, their sacred books committed to the flames, and themselves deprived of all civil rights and honours.⁴ This *first* edict spared the lives of the Christians ;

to wish for, unless it were that one or more of the emperors might embrace their religion. *Schl.*]

¹ [He had Christians in his court, who understood how to lead him, and who would probably have brought him to renounce idolatry, had not the suggestions of their enemies prevailed with him. His wife *Prisca* was, in reality, a concealed Christian; and also his daughter *Valeria*, the wife of *Galerius Maximianus*. See *Lactantius, de Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. 15. *Schl.*]

² [Some go still further, and make him to have been actually a Christian. But from the representations of *Eusebius, H. E. viii. 13*, no more can be inferred, than that he was disposed to look favourably upon the Christian religion. *Schl.*]

³ *Eusebius, de Vita Constantini*, ii. 50. *Lactantius, Institut. Divinar.* iv. 27, and *de Mortibus Persecutor.* c. 10. [According to *Eusebius, l. c.*, it was reported to the emperor, that the oracle of *Apollo* had declared, he was prevented from giving true responses by the *righteous men on the earth*; and this the pagan priests interpreted, when questioned by the emperor, with reference to the Christians. According to *Lactantius, ubi supra*, while *Diocletian* was at *Antioch*, in the year 302, the priests who inspected the entrails of the consecrated victims, declared, that they were interrupted in their prognostications by the sign of the cross made by several of the emperor's servants. *Schl.*]

⁴ *Lactantius, de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 11. *Eusebius, H. E. viii. 2*. [This persecution should, properly, be named that of *Galerius Maximianus*, and not that of *Diocletian*. For *Diocletian* had much the least

hand in it; and he resigned his authority before the persecution had continued quite two years; moreover, *Galerius*, in his edict for putting an end to the persecution, a little before his death, acknowledges that he himself was the author of it. See *Eusebius, H. E. viii. 17*, and *Lactantius, de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 34. *Romulia*, the mother of *Galerius*, who was a very superstitious and haughty woman, and who was offended that the Christians would not allow her to be present when they celebrated the Lord's supper, contributed to inflame the rage of her son against them. Perhaps also the Platonic philosophers had some influence in exciting the emperor's hostility; for they represented the many sects among the Christians in a most odious light, and taxed them with having apostatised from the religion of the early Christians. *Eusebius, H. E. viii. 17*. But political considerations may have influenced him. *Galerius* contemplated getting rid of his colleagues, and making himself sole emperor. The Christians, who were attached to *Constantius Chlorus* and his son, seemed to him to stand in the way of his designs; and he wished to weaken their power, or rather to annihilate it, as far as practicable. But *Diocletian* was not disposed to further his cruel project. He was willing to exclude Christians from the palace and the army, and to compel all who served him at court or in the armies to offer sacrifices to the gods; but not to suspend over them penal laws and executions. *Galerius* would have had them all brought to the stake. A council was called, composed of learned civilians and officers in the army, which declared against the Christians. To this

for *Diocletian* was averse from slaughter and bloodshed. Yet it caused many Christians to be put to death, particularly those who refused to deliver up their sacred books to the magistrates.¹ Seeing this, many Christians, among whom were even bishops and priests, in order to save life, gave up the books and sacred things in their possession. These were, however, charged with sacrilege by others of greater constancy, and branded with the ignominious name of *Traditors*.²

§ 3. Not long after the publication of this first edict, two conflagrations broke out in the palace of Nicomedia; which their enemies persuaded *Diocletian* to believe were kindled by Christians. Hence he ordered many of them in that city to be tortured and punished as incendiaries.³ Nearly at the same time there were insurrections in Armenia and in Syria; and as their enemies charged the blame of these also upon the Christians, the emperor by a *new* edict ordered all bishops and ministers of holy things to be thrown into prison; and by a *third* edict, soon after, he ordered that all these prisoners should be compelled by tortures and punishments to offer sacrifice to the gods;⁴ for he hoped, if the bishops and teachers were once overcome, that the Christian churches would follow their example. A great multitude, accordingly, of excellent men, in every part of the Roman empire, Gaul only excepted, which *Constantius Chlorus* governed,⁵ either suffered capitally, or were sent to the mines.

decision, Hierocles, the governor of Bithynia, and one who afterwards wrote against the Christians, contributed not a little. But *Diocletian* would not yet give up entirely. He would consult the oracle of Apollo at Miletus; which likewise directed the extirpation of the Christians. But even Apollo could not move the superstitious emperor to the extreme of cruelty. He decreed indeed a persecution, but it was to cost no blood. It commenced with the demolition of the Christian temple at Nicomedia, and the burning of the books found in it. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 916—922. *Schl.*]

¹ Augustine, *Breviculus collat. cum Donatistis*, c. 15, 17, in his *Opp.* ix. 387, 390, and Baluze, *Miscellan.* ii. 77, 92.

² Optatus Milevit. *de Schismate Donatist.* l. i. § 13, p. 13, ed. Du Pin.

³ Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. 6. Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 14. Constantine the Gr. *Oratio ad Sanctorum Cætum*, c. 25. — [After the second conflagration, Galerius left Nicomedia, pretending to be afraid of being burnt up by the Christians. *Diocletian* also compelled his wife and daughter to sacrifice; and caused many Christians of his household and court to be cut off, and Anthimus, the bishop of Nicomedia, with many of the clergy and common Christians, to undergo cruel deaths, because they refused to sacrifice. *Schl.*]

⁴ Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. 6, and *de Martyribus Palestine*. — [Some probability might be attached to the charge against the Christians, from the fact that inconsiderate zeal sometimes led them to deeds which had an aspect of rebellion. At the commencement of this persecution, for example, a very respectable Christian tore down the imperial edict against the Christians, which was set up in a public place. Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. 5. *Schl.*]

⁵ Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutorum*, c. 15. Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. 13, 18. [Constantius Chlorus presided over Spain and Britain, as well as Gaul. In Spain there were some martyrs; for Constantius not being present in person could not prevent the rigorous execution of the decree of the senior emperor. But in Gaul, where he was present, he favoured the Christians, as much as sound policy would permit. He suffered some of the churches to be demolished, and most of them to be shut up. And when the last edict of Galerius against the Christians was promulgated, he enjoined upon all his Christian servants to relinquish either their mode of worship or their offices; and when they had made their election, he deprived all those of their offices who resolved to adhere to Christian worship, and retained the others in his service. *Schl.*]

§ 4. In the second year of this persecution, A. D. 304, *Diocletian* published a *fourth* edict, at the instigation of his son-in-law and of other enemies to the Christian name. The magistrates were now directed to make free use of torture for forcing all Christians into worship of the gods.¹ These orders being strictly obeyed by men in power, the Christian church was reduced to the last extremity.² *Galerius Maximianus*, therefore, no longer hesitated to disclose the secret designs that he had long entertained.³ He required his father-in-law,⁴ together with his colleague *Maximianus Herculeus*, to divest themselves of their power, and constituted himself emperor of the East, leaving the West to *Constantius Chlorus*, whose health he knew to be infirm. He also associated with him in the government two assistants, of his own choosing; namely, *Maximinus*, his sister's son, and *Severus*; excluding altogether *Constantine*,⁵ afterwards styled *the Great*, the son of *Constantius Chlorus*. This revolution in the Roman government restored peace to the Christians in the western provinces, which were under *Constantius*;⁶ but in the

¹ Eusebius, *de Martyr. Palestinae*, c. 3. — [Diocletian was not yet willing the Christians should be put to death outright; his orders to the governors were, that they should compel the Christians, by all kinds of corporeal sufferings, to give honour to the gods. Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, ii. 51. Lactantius, *Institut. Divinar.* v. 11. Euseb. *H. E.* ix. 9, and viii. 12. Hence, according with the disposition of the several governors, was the execution of the imperial edict. Some only sent the Christians into banishment, when the attempt to make them offer sacrifices failed. Others deprived them of an eye, or lamed one of their feet by burning it; and others exposed them to wild beasts; or lacerated their bodies with iron hooks, or with the scourge, and afterwards sprinkled vinegar and salt on the wounds, or dropped melted lead into them. In Phrygia, a whole city with all its inhabitants was burnt to ashes, because not an individual in it would sacrifice. Lactantius, *Instit. Divinar.* v. 11. Some Christians also brought death upon themselves, by holding religious meetings contrary to the emperor's prohibition, or by voluntarily presenting themselves before the governors, and requesting to be martyred. Sulpitius Severus, *Hist. Sacra*, ii. 32, and Euseb. *de Mart. Pal.* c. 3. *Schl.*]

² Lactantius, *Instit. Divinar.* l. v. c. 11. — [Streams of Christian blood flowed in all the provinces of the Roman empire except Gaul. Everywhere the Christian temples lay in ruins, and all assemblies for worship were suspended. The major part had forsaken the provinces, and taken refuge among the barbarians. Such as were unable or unwilling to do this, kept themselves concealed, and were afraid for their lives if they appeared in public. The ministers of Christ

were either slain, or mutilated and sent to the mines, or banished the country. The avaricious magistrates and judges had seized upon nearly all their church property and their private possessions. Many, through dread of undergoing torture, had made away with their own lives, and many had apostatised from the faith; and what remained of the Christian community, consisted of a few weak, poor, and timorous persons. *Schl.*]

³ [A. D. 305. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Diocletian. *Tr.*]

⁵ Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 18, 20. — [Galerius was in more fear of the young prince Constantine, than of his father Constantius; the latter being a mild and sickly sovereign, while Constantine was of an ardent temperament, and greatly beloved by the people and the soldiers. Yet Galerius had this prince in his power; for he detained him at his court in Nicomedia, and, if he found occasion, might have put him out of his way by assassination, or some other means. Indeed, Galerius attempted this, especially in the year 306. Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 24. But Constantine saved himself by flight, and repaired to his father in Britain. This sagacity of the prince overthrew the whole plan of the emperor, and was the means of rescuing the Christian religion from its jeopardy. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 942, &c. *Schl.*]

⁶ Euseb. *de Mart. Pal.* c. 13. — [Eusebius says expressly, that Italy, Sicily, Gaul, Spain, Mauritania, and Africa, enjoyed peace after the first two years of the persecution. Nor was this strange; for Constantius Chlorus, who governed Britain, Spain, and Gaul, was a friend to the Christians; and Severus, who as Cæsar held the other western provinces, was obliged to show deference to

eastern provinces, the persecution raged with even greater severity than before.¹

§ 5. But Divine Providence frustrated the whole plan of *Galerius Maximianus*. For, *Constantius Chlorus* dying in Britain, in the year 306, the soldiers saluted his son *Constantine Augustus*, the very man known from achievements as *the Great*; an unlucky chance which the tyrant had not only to bear, but also to approve. Soon after, a civil war broke out. For *Maxentius*, the son-in-law of *Galerius*, assumed himself the imperial dignity, because he could not bear to see it bestowed, by his father-in-law's mortifying partiality, upon *Severus*, and he took his father, *Maximianus Herculius*, for his colleague in the empire. In the midst of these commotions, *Constantine*, beyond all expectation, made his way to the imperial throne. The western Christians, those of Italy and Africa excepted, enjoyed a good degree of tranquillity and liberty during these civil wars.² But the oriental churches experienced various fortune, adverse or tolerable, according to the political changes from year to year.³ At length *Galerius Maximianus*, who had been the author of their heaviest calamities, being brought low by a terrific and protracted disease, and finding himself ready to die, in the year 311, issued a decree which restored peace to them after they had endured almost unbounded sufferings.⁴

Constantius as emperor. Neither was he himself inclined to cruelty. Yet the Christians enjoyed less freedom under him, than under *Constantius*. See *Optatus Milevitanus, de Schismate Donatist.* i. 14 and 16. *Schl.*]

¹ *Lactantius, de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 21, [here states, that *Galerius* gave orders, that such Christians as could not by tortures be induced to sacrifice, should be roasted over a slow fire. *Schl.*]

² [Constantine, as soon as he came into power; gave the Christians full liberty to profess and to practise their religion. *Lactantius, de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 24, and *Institut. Divinar.* i. 1. This he did, not from a sense of justice, or from magnanimity, and still less from any attachment to the Christian religion, but from principles of worldly prudence. He wished to attach the Christians to his party, that they might protect him against the power and the machinations of *Galerius*. His brother-in-law, *Maxentius*, imitated his example; and with similar views; and therefore the Christians under him in Africa and Italy enjoyed entire religious liberty. See *Optatus Milevitanus, de Schismate Donatist.* i. 16, and *Euseb. H. E.* viii. 14. See *Mosheim, Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 952, &c. *Schl.*]

³ [In the eastern provinces, which were under the government of *Galerius Maximianus* and *C. Galerius Maximinus*, Christians were the most cruelly persecuted; as is manifest from various passages in *Eusebius*. Yet *C. G. Maximin* did not at all times treat them with equal severity. According to

Euseb. (de Martyr. Palestina, c. 9), in the year 308, the persecution seemed to be at an end in Syria and Palestine: but it soon after recommenced, with increased severity. The cause of these vicissitudes is to be sought in the political state of things. In this year, *C. G. Maximin* assumed the title of *Augustus* in Syria, against the will of *Galerius*; and the latter appeared about to declare war against the former; who therefore was indulgent towards the Christians, in order to secure their friendship. But as *Galerius* was appeased, *C. G. Maximin* became more severe against the Christians, in order to ingratiate himself more effectually with the emperor. After a while, however, he abated his severity; and towards the end of the year 309 and in the beginning of 310, the Christians enjoyed great freedom (*Euseb. de Martyr. Palestina, c. 13*); for *Galerius* was now in declining health, and in such circumstances *C. G. Maximin* wished not to alienate the Christians from himself. But when the governor of the province informed him, in 310, that the Christians abused their freedom, *Maximin* renewed the persecution. But soon after *Galerius* was seized with his last and fatal sickness, and *C. G. Maximin* being apprehensive that the imperial power could be secured only by a successful appeal to arms, policy required him again to desist from persecuting the Christians. *Eusebius, H. E.* viii. 16. See *Mosheim, Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 955, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ *Eusebius, H. E.* viii. 16, 17. *Lactantius, de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 33, 34.

§ 6. After the death of *Galerius Maximianus*,¹ *Maximinus* and *Licinius*² divided between themselves the provinces which had been governed by him. At the same time *Maxentius*, who held Africa and Italy, determined to make war upon *Constantine*, who governed in Spain and Gaul, in order to bring all the West under his authority. *Constantine* anticipated his designs, marched his army into Italy in the year 312, and, in a battle fought at the Milvian bridge near Rome, routed the army of *Maxentius*. In the flight, the bridge broke down, and *Maxentius*, falling into the Tiber, was drowned. After this victory, *Constantine*, with his colleague *Licinius*, immediately gave full liberty to the Christians of living according to their own institutions and laws; and this liberty was more clearly defined the following year, A. D. 313, in a new edict drawn up at Milan.³ *Maximin*, indeed, who reigned in the East, was projecting new calamities for the Christians,⁴ and menacing the emperors of the West with war; but being vanquished by *Licinius*, he put an end to his own life by swallowing poison at Tarsus, in the year 313.

§ 7. About this time, *Constantine* the Great, who was previously a man of no religion, is said to have embraced Christianity, being

¹ [A. D. 311. *Tr.*]

² [Who was created *Augustus* by *Galerius Maximianus*, after the death of *Flavius Severus*, A. D. 307. *Tr.*]

³ Eusebius, *H. E.* x. 5. Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 48. [It is the second edict, or that of Milan, which is found in the passages here referred to: Eusebius gives it in Greek, Lactantius in Latin. The first edict is wholly lost; yet from the second we may learn what was obscure or indefinite in the first. The first edict gave religious freedom, not only to the Christians, but to all other sects; yet it forbade any person from abandoning the religion in which he had been born and brought up. This prohibition operated disadvantageously to the Christian cause, and occasioned many, who had recently embraced Christianity, to return to their former religion, in obedience to the imperial edict. This prohibition, therefore, with all other restraints, was removed in the second edict. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 959. *Schl.*]

⁴ [C. Gal. Maximin did not at first venture to contravene the edict of *Galerius Maximianus* (giving full toleration to the Christians), yet he did not publish it in his provinces; but afterwards, by underhand evasions, he violated it. For, if we may believe Lactantius (*de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 36), he slyly so managed, that what some cities petitioned for, namely, that the Christians might be prevented from erecting temples within their walls, was effected. Eusebius relates (*H. E.* x. 2) that, through the medium of one Theotecnus, he induced the Antiochians to petition to him, that no Christian might be allowed to reside in their

city, and then granted them their petition. Other cities followed this example, and thus a new persecution was set on foot. Perhaps Lactantius and Eusebius erred, in representing Maximin as the original cause of these applications to himself. Such petitions were in fact presented; and as the emperor was about engaging in war with *Constantine*, he used every means to secure the fidelity of cities in the East to himself; and as the persecution of the Christians was one of the means to be used, therefore he gratified their wishes. Subsequently, when the first edict of *Constantine* and *Licinius* was brought to him, in the year 312, he would not suffer it to be published in his provinces; probably from pride, he deeming it unsuitable for him to be publisher of edicts given out by persons whom he regarded as his inferiors in rank. Yet, according to Eusebius (*H. E.* ix. 9), he sent a letter to his governors of provinces, which was very favourable to the Christians, and in which he requested his subjects to treat them kindly and tenderly. The Christians, however, put no confidence in this letter, but were still afraid openly to profess their religion. But after he had been vanquished by *Licinius*, in the year 313, he published a new edict in favour of the Christians (*Euseb. H. E.* ix. 10), in which he laments that the judges and magistrates had misinterpreted the former law; and he now expressly gives the Christians liberty to rebuild their temples, and commands that the property taken from them should be restored. Soon after this he died, and the ten years' persecution ended. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 961, &c. *Schl.*]

chiefly moved by the miracle of a cross that he saw in the heavens. But this account is very doubtful. For his first edict in favour of the Christians, and many other things, sufficiently declare that he was indeed at that time well disposed towards the Christians and their worship, but that he by no means regarded Christianity as the only true and saving religion. On the contrary, he appears to have thought other religions, and among them that of old professed in Rome, as likewise true and useful to mankind; he therefore wished every one of them to be freely practised in the Roman world.¹ But as time ran on, *Constantine* kept pace with it in the knowledge of things divine, and he gradually came to regard Christianity as the only true and saving religion, all others as false and impious. When his mind was thus made up, he next employed himself in exhorting his subjects to embrace Christianity, and at length he went so far as to proclaim war against the ancient superstitions. At what time this alteration in the emperor's views took place, and he began to look upon all religions but the Christian as false, cannot be determined. This is, however, certain, that the change was first made manifest by his laws and edicts, in the year 324, after the death of *Licinius*, when he became sole emperor.² His purpose, however, of abolishing the ancient religion of the Romans, and of tolerating no other than the Christian, he did not disclose before the very end of life, when he issued edicts for pulling down the pagan temples and abrogating sacrifices.³

¹ [This is evident from Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, i. 27. In the commencement of the war with Maxentius, he was still at a loss to what God he should trust himself and his affairs. He at length determined to honour that one God only whom his father had worshipped, and to show no reverence to the ancient Roman deities. The grounds on which he came to this decision were feeble: namely, the good fortune of his father, who adhered to this worship; and the ill fortune and lamentable end of Diocletian, Galerius Maximian, and other emperors, who had worshipped the pagan deities. And, according to Eusebius (*de Vita Constantini*, i. 28), he knew so little of the God of his father, that he prayed he might be able to know him. He was a *deist* of the lowest class, who considered the God of his father as a limited being, though more benevolent and powerful than any of the Greek and Roman deities. This is manifest from his regulations in favour of the Christians, and from his laws tolerating the pagan *haruspices*. *Codex Theodos.* l. ix. tit. 16, leg. 1, 2, and l. xvi. tit. 10. leg. i. Compare Zosimus, lib. ii. p. 10, ed. Oxford, 1679, 8vo. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 971, &c. *Schl.*]

² Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, ii. 20 and 44. [In this year, 324, all those who, for their adherence to Christianity during

the preceding persecution, had become exiles, or been sent to the mines, or been robbed of their property, were restored to their country, their liberty, and their possessions; and the Christian temples were ordered to be rebuilt and enlarged. *Schl.*]

³ See Ja. Godefroi, *ad Codicem Theodos.* tom. vi. pt. i. p. 290, &c. [Zosimus (lib. ii. p. 104) says, that after the death of Licinius, a certain Egyptian came to Rome from Spain, and convinced the emperor of the truth of the Christian religion. This was probably Hosius, the bishop of Corduba, who was an Egyptian, and was then at the court of Constantine, very probably soliciting the restoration of the church goods which had been confiscated; at least, it is expressly stated, that the money destined for Africa was paid in consequence of his efforts. This conjecture is favoured by Baumgarten, *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* ii. 691. The later Greeks ascribe the emperor's conversion to a courtier named Euphrates; of whom, however, the ancients make no mention. Theodoret (*H. E.* i. 17) ascribes it to the influence of Helena, his mother; but she was brought to embrace Christianity by her son, according to Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, iii. 47. — Zosimus relates, further, that Constantine asked the pagan priests to absolve him from the guilt of destroying Licinius, Fausta, and Crispus;

§ 8. That the emperor acted from real, not simulated motives, no one can doubt who considers men's actions any clue to their feelings. It is, indeed, true, that *Constantine's* life was not such as the precepts of Christianity required;¹ and it is also true, that he remained a *catechumen* all his life, and was received to full membership in the church, by baptism, only a few days before his death, at Nicomedia.² But neither of these is adequate proof that the emperor had not a general conviction of the truth of the Christian religion, or that he only feigned himself a Christian. For in that age many persons deferred baptism till near the close of life, that they might pass into the other world altogether pure and undefiled with sin;³ and it is but too notorious, that many, who think nothing more true and divine than Christianity, live, notwithstanding, in violation of its precepts. It is another question, whether worldly reasons might not have had some share in making Constantine prefer the Christian religion to that of ancient Rome and every other, and in his recommendation of it to his people. He may, indeed, have viewed it with

and when they told him this was impossible, the Egyptian, before mentioned, undertook to show that the Christian religion offered the means of cleansing away his guilt; and this induced the emperor to embrace Christianity. There is, perhaps, some degree of truth in this story; perhaps Constantine did, in fact, after the death of Licinius, first learn, either from this Egyptian, or from some others, that the blood of Christ was expiatory for believers therein. It is certain that in the first years after his victory over Maxentius, he had very incorrect ideas of Christ and of the Christian religion; as is manifest from his *Rescript. to Anulinus*, in Eusebius, *H. E.* x. 7. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christ.* p. 976, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ [He put to death his own son Crispus, and his wife Fausta, on a groundless suspicion; and cut off his brother-in-law Licinius, and his unoffending son, contrary to his plighted word; and was much addicted to pride and voluptuousness. *Schl.*]

² Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, lib. iv. c. 61, 62. Those who, in reliance on more recent and dubious authorities, maintain that Constantine received Christian baptism at Rome, in the year 324, and from the hands of Sylvester, then the bishop of Rome, do not at this day gain the assent of intelligent men, even in the Roman Catholic church. See Henry Noris, *Historia Donatist.* in his *Opp.* iv. 650. Tho. Maria Mamachius, *Origines et Antiqq. Christianæ*, ii. 232, &c. [Valesius, in his Notes on Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, iv. 61, where Eusebius relates, that Constantine first received *imposition of hands*, previous to his baptism, a little before his death, infers, that the emperor then first became a

catechumen, because he then first received imposition of hands. But the bishops laid hands on the catechumens at various times, and for various purposes: and the connexion here shows, that Eusebius refers to that imposition of hands which immediately preceded, and was connected with, baptism. See Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, c. 20. It will not follow, therefore, that Constantine had never before received imposition of hands for other purposes. But suppose he had not, still we do not know that the only mode of constituting a catechumen, in that age, was by imposition of hands: and if it was, so great an emperor might be excused from the ceremony, which could plead no divine authority. That Constantine, long before this time, declared himself a *Christian*, and was acknowledged as such by the churches, is certain. It is also true that he had, for a long time, performed the religious acts of an unbaptized Christian, that is, of a *catechumen*; for he attended public worship, fasted, prayed, observed the Christian Sabbath, and the anniversaries of the martyrs, and watched on the vigils of Easter, &c. &c. Now these facts show that he had long been a catechumen; and that he did not first become so, at the time hands were laid on him in order to his baptism. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 966, &c. *Tr.*—The learned author says there, that *catechumens* were made by the imposition of hands and prayer, and that this ceremony was repeated by the bishops a little before baptism, after a confession of sin, and a solemn renunciation of the devil. *S.*]

³ [See Ant. Fred. Busching's *Disput. de Procrastinatione Baptismi apud veteres, ejusque Causis.* *Schl.*]

a sovereign's eye, as a mighty instrument, while idolatry was none at all, for strengthening an empire and keeping subjects to their duty.¹

§ 9. The sign of the cross, which *Constantine* most solemnly affirmed was seen by him in the heavens, near mid-day, is a subject involved in the greatest obscurities and difficulties. It is, however, an easy thing to refute those who regard this prodigy as a cunning fiction of the emperor, or who rank it among fables;² and also those who refer the appearance to natural causes, ingeniously conjecturing that a cross was formed in a solar halo, or in the moon;³ and like-

¹ See Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, i. 27. [The Romans had then lost nearly all their former virtue, fidelity, good sense, and valour; and in their place, tyranny, profigacy, and shameful vices and crimes succeeded, and became prevalent, especially during the persecution of the Christians. Among the more intelligent, very little of the ancient superstitious spirit remained; so effectually had the Christian and pagan philosophers exposed the turpitude of the old religion. But among the Christians, who were spread far and wide in the Roman empire, and here and there had brought over some of the neighbouring nations to their religion, great firmness and stability of mind were manifest, together with good faith and honesty. Hence Constantine the Great might readily see, that the Christian religion would contribute much more to the tranquillity of the empire, and to the establishment of his dominion, than the old religion could do. *Schl.*]

² Joh. Hornbeck, *Comment. ad Bullam Urbani VIII. de Imaginum Cultu*, p. 182, &c. Ja. Oiselius, *Thesaurus Numismat. antiquor.* p. 463. Ja. Tollius, Preface to his French translation of *Longinus*; and in his notes on Lactantius *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 44. Christ. Thomasius, *Observat. Hallens.* tom. i. p. 380; and others. [There is a difference of opinion as to the time when, and the place where, the emperor saw this cross. Some follow Eusebius (*de Vita Constantini*, i. 28), and believe that he saw it while in Gaul, and when making preparations for the war with Maxentius. Others rely on the testimony of Lactantius (*de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 44), and believe that he saw the cross on the 26th day of October, A. D. 312 [the day before the battle in which Maxentius was vanquished, near Rome]. So thought Stephan. Baluze (see his notes on this passage in *Lactantius*); whom Pagi, Fabricius, and others have followed. The point is a difficult one to decide; and the brothers Ballerini (*Observ. ad Norisii Hist. Donatist.* Opp. iv. 662) would compromise it, by supposing there were two appearances of the cross, both in dreams, the first in Gaul,

and the last in Italy, which is a miserable shift. Among those who regard the whole story as a fabrication, some suppose that it was a pious fraud, and others that it was a trick of state. The first supposition is most improbable. For, at the time when the cross is said to have appeared to him, Constantine thought nothing about spreading the Christian religion, but only about vanquishing Maxentius. Besides, he was not then a Christian, and did not use the event for the advancement of Christianity, but for the animation of his troops. The other supposition has more probability; indeed, Licinius once resorted to something like this, according to Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecut.* c. 46. But Constantine solemnly averred the reality of this prodigy; and if he had been inclined to use artifice, in order to enkindle courage in his soldiers, he would far more probably, as his army was made up chiefly of barbarians, and such as were not Christians (see Zosimus, ii. 86), have represented Mars or some other of the vulgar deities, as appearing to him. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 978, &c. *Schl.*]

³ See Joh. Andr. Schmidt, *Diss. de Luna in Cruce visa*, Jena, 1681, 4to, and Jo. Albert Fabricius, *Diss. de Cruce a Constantino visa*, in his *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. vi. cap. i. p. 8, &c.—[This opinion also has its difficulties. Fabricius himself admits, that, on his hypothesis, the appearance of visible words in the air cannot be explained; and believes that the words, *By this conquer* (τοῦτ' ἐνίκη, hac vince), were not actually seen, but that the sense of them was emblematically depicted in a crown of victory that appeared in the heavens. But (1) if the emperor intended to say this, he expressed himself very obscurely. (2) It is certain that Constantine did not intend to be so understood; for he caused the very words mentioned to be affixed to the standards (*Labara*) of the legions, and to the medals and other monuments of the event; which he would not have done, had he not designed it should be understood, that these words were actually seen in the

wise those who ascribe the thing to divine power, then exerted for the confirmation by a miracle of Constantine's wavering faith.¹ Each

heavens. (3) All the ancient writers so understood the account given by Eusebius. (4) Such a halo about the sun, as that described by the emperor, has never been seen by man. For he did not see the *sign* or *form* of a real cross, but the *Greek letter X*, intersected perpendicularly by the letter

P, thus  [Euseb. *de Vita Constant.*

i. i. § 31]. See Mesheim, *Comment. de Reb. Christ.* p. 986. *Schl.*]

¹ [Eusebius alone (*de Vita Constantini*, i. 28—31), among the writers of that age, gives us any account of the vision of the cross; though Lactantius (*de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 44) and others speak of the 'dream,' in which Constantine was directed to use the sign of the cross. Eusebius' account is as follows: 'He conceived that he ought to worship only the God of his father. He therefore called upon this God, in prayer, entreating and beseeching him to manifest to him who he was, and to extend his right arm, on the present occasion. While he was thus praying with earnest entreaty, a most singular divine manifestation (*θεοσημία τις παραδοξοτάτη*) appeared: which, perhaps, had another declared it, would not easily be credited: but the victorious emperor himself having related it, to us who write this, when we had, a long time afterwards, the privilege of knowing and conversing with him, and having confirmed it with an oath, who can hesitate to believe the account? and especially, as the subsequent time [or the events which followed] affords evidence of its truth? He said that, about the middle hours of the day, as the sun began to verge towards its setting, he saw in the heavens, with his own eyes, the sun surmounted with the trophy of the cross (*ὑπερ-κείμενον τοῦ ἡλίου σταυροῦ πρόπαιον*), which was composed of light, and had a legend (*γραφὴν*) annexed, saying, *By this conquer*. And amazement seized him, and the whole army, at the sight (*ἐπὶ τῷ δεσμάτι*), and the beholders wondered, as they accompanied him in the march. And he said he was at a loss what to make of this spectre (*τί ποτε εἶν τὸ φάσμα*), and as he pondered and reflected upon it long, night came upon him by surprise. After this, as he slept (*ὑπνούντι αὐτῷ*), the Christ of God appeared to him, together with the sign before seen in the heavens, and bade him make a representation of the sign that appeared in the heavens, and to use that as a protection (*τοῦτω ἀλεξήματι χρῆσθαι*) against the onsets of his enemies. As soon as it was day, he arose, related the wonder (*τὸ ἀπόρρητον*) to

his friends; and then assembling the workers in gold and precious stones, he seated himself in the midst of them, and describing the appearance of the sign (*τοῦ σημείου*), he bade them imitate it in gold and precious stones. This we were once so fortunate as to set our eyes upon.' Eusebius then goes into a long description of this sacred standard, which was called the *Labarum*. Its shaft was a very long spear, overlaid with gold. On its top was a crown composed of gold and precious stones, and containing the sacred symbol, namely, the Greek letter X, intersected with the letter P. Just under this crown was a likeness of the emperor, in gold; and below that, a cross piece of wood, from which hung a square flag, of purple cloth embroidered and covered with precious stones.—Now, if this narrative is all true, and if two connected miracles were actually wrought, as here stated, how happens it, that no writer of that age, except Eusebius, says one word about the luminous cross in the heavens?—How came it, that Eusebius himself said nothing about it in his *Eccles. History*, which was written twelve years after the event, and about the same length of time before his *Life of Constantine*? Why does he rely solely on the testimony of the emperor, and not even intimate that he ever heard of it from others; whereas, if true, many thousands must have been eye-witnesses of the fact?—What mean his suggestions, that some may question the truth of the story; and his caution not to state anything as a matter of public notoriety, but to confine himself simply to the emperor's private representation to himself?—Again, if the miracle of the luminous cross was a reality, has not God himself sanctioned the use of the cross, as the appointed symbol of our religion? so that there is no superstition in the use of it; but the Catholics are correct, and the Protestants in an error, on this subject.—If God intended to enlighten Constantine's dark mind, and show him the truth of Christianity, would he probably use for the purpose the enigma of the luminous cross, in preference to his inspired word, or a direct and special revelation? Was there no tendency to encourage a superstitious veneration for the sign of the cross, in such a miracle?—And can it be believed, that Jesus Christ actually appeared to the emperor, in a vision, directing him to make an artificial cross, and to *rely upon that* as his *defence* in the day of battle?—But how came the whole story of the luminous cross to be unknown to the Christian world, for more than twenty-five years, and then to

of these suppositions has, indeed, been overthrown, and nothing then is left, but to suppose, that *Constantine* saw in a dream, while asleep, the appearance of a cross, with the inscription, *By this conquer*.¹ Nor is this opinion unsupported by competent authorities of good credit.²

§ 10. The happiness anticipated by the Christians from the edicts of *Constantine* and *Licinius*, was a little afterwards interrupted by *Licinius*, who waged war against his kinsman *Constantine*. Being vanquished in the year 314, he was quiet for about nine years. But in the year 324, this restless man again attacked *Constantine*, being urged on both by his own inclination and by the instigation of the pagan priests. That he might secure to himself a victory, he attached the pagans to his cause, by severely oppressing the Christians, and cruelly putting not a few of their bishops to death.³ But his plans failed once more. For, after several unsuccessful battles, he was obliged to throw himself upon the mercy of the victor, who, nevertheless, ordered him to be strangled, in the year 325. After his victory over *Licinius*, *Constantine* reigned sole emperor till his death; and by

transpire only through a private conversation between Eusebius and *Constantine*?—Is it not supposable, that Eusebius may have misunderstood the account the emperor gave him, of a singular halo about the sun, which he saw, and of an affecting dream which he had the night after, and which induced him to make the *Labarum*, and use it as his standard? Such are the arguments against this hypothesis. *Tr.*—Compare with this curious *petitio principii*, the conclusion of Dr. Burton, *Eccles.* Hist. 644. 'I do not see that the writer of history is called upon to give his opinion in a case like the present; but after impartially reviewing all the evidence, I should be inclined to say thus much, that if *Constantine* had told Eusebius that the cross had been seen only by himself, I should not have ventured to admit the truth of his narration; but when he asserted that the same sight had been witnessed by the whole army, it is difficult to believe that he wilfully invented a falsehood which was so certain to be detected.' *Ed.*

¹ [Lactantius mentions only the dream; and the same is true of Sozomen, i. 3; and Rufinus, in his translation of the *H. E.* of Eusebius; and likewise of the author of the *Chronicon Orientale*, p. 57. Indeed the appeal of Eusebius to the solemn attestation of the emperor (*de Vita Constantini*, i. 28), and the statement of Gelasius Cyzicenus (*Acta Concilii Nicæni*, i. 4, in Harduin's *Concilia*, i. 351), that the whole story was accounted fabulous by the pagans, confirm the supposition, that it was a mere dream. For the appeal of Eusebius would have been unnecessary, and the denial of its reality by the pagans would have been impossible, if the whole army of *Constantine* had been

eye-witnesses of the event. *Schl.*]

² The writers who treat of *Constantine* the Great, are carefully enumerated by Joh. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, &c. c. 12, p. 260, &c. [The latest and by far the best (says Heeren, *Ancient Hist.* p. 475, ed. Bancroft, 1828) is, *Leben Constantin des Grossen*, von J. C. F. Manso, Bresl. 1817.] Fabricius moreover (*ibid.* c. 13, p. 273, &c.) describes the laws of *Constantine*, relating to religious matters, under four heads. The same laws are treated of by Jac. Godefroi, *Adnot. ad Codicem Theodosianum*; and in a particular treatise, by Francis Baldwin, in his *Constantinus Magn. seu de Legibus Constantinæ Ecclesiast. et Civilibus*, lib. ii. ed. 2nd, by B. Gundling, Halle, 1727, 8vo.

³ Eusebius, *H. E.* x. 8, and *de Vita Constantini*, i. 49. Even Julian, than whom no one was more prejudiced against *Constantine*, could not but pronounce *Licinius* an infamous tyrant, who was sunk in vices and crimes. See Julian's *Cæsares*, p. 222, ed. Spanheim. I would here observe, what appears to have been overlooked hitherto, that Aurelius Victor mentions this persecution of *Licinius*, in his book *de Cæsaribus*, c. 41, p. 435, ed. Arntzenii, where he says: *Licinio ne insontium quidem ac nobilium philosophorum servili more cruciatus adhibiti modum fecere*. The Philosophers, whom *Licinius* is here said to have tortured, were, doubtless, *Christians*; whom many, from their slight acquaintance with our religion, have mistaken for a sect of philosophers. The commentators on Aurelius have left this passage untouched; which is apt to be the case with those who are intent only on the enlargement of grammatical knowledge derived from ancient writers.

policy, enactments, regulations, and munificence, endeavoured as much as possible to obliterate gradually the ancient superstitions, and to establish Christian worship throughout the Roman empire.¹ He had undoubtedly learned from the wars and the machinations of *Licinius*, that neither himself nor the Roman empire could remain secure while the ancient superstition continued prevalent; and therefore, from this time onward, he openly opposed the pagan deities and their worship, as prejudicial to the interests of the state.

§ 11. After the death of *Constantine*, which happened in the year 337, his three surviving sons, *Constantine II.*, *Constantius* and *Constans*, assumed the empire, and were all saluted *Augusti* and emperors by the Roman senate. There were still living two brothers of *Constantine the Great*, namely, *Constantius Dalmatius*, and *Julius Constantius*, and they had several sons. But nearly all these were slain by the soldiers at the command of *Constantine's* sons, who feared lest their thirst for power might lead them to make insurrections and disturb the commonwealth.² Only *Gallus* and *Julian*, sons of *Julius Constantius*, with some difficulty escaped the massacre;³ and the latter of these afterwards became emperor. *Constantine II.* held Britain, Gaul, and Spain; but lost his life, A. D. 340, in a war with his brother *Constantius*. *Constans* at first governed only Illyricum, Italy, and Africa; but after the fall of his brother *Constantine II.* he annexed his provinces to his empire, and thus became emperor of all the West, until he lost his life A. D. 350, in the war with *Magnentius*, a usurper. After the death of *Constans*, *Magnentius* being subdued, the third brother, *Constantius*, who had before governed Asia, Syria, and Egypt, in the year 353 became sole emperor, and governed the whole empire till the year 361, when he died.

¹ [Constantine doubtless committed errors which, in their consequences, were injurious to the cause of Christianity. He gave to the clergy the former privileges of the pagan priests, and allowed legacies to be left to the churches, which were everywhere erected and enlarged. He was gratified with seeing the bishops assume great state; for he thought, the more respect the bishops commanded, the more inclined the pagans would be to embrace Christianity: and thus he introduced the love of pomp and display among the clergy. *Schl.*—It will be seen in section 12, that Julian made war upon Christianity, by abrogating its privileges, and closing its schools for the refinement of mankind. This is no mean testimony to the soundness of Constantine's liberality. So far as Christian ministers, indeed, are personally concerned, there is no justice in their exclusion from such circumstances of comfort and respectability as are open to their kinsmen and compatriots generally. Nor will their ministry carry the weight which the best interests of the world at large require, unless it is allowed to take its due place among liberal professions; which it

never can, while hopelessly confined among poverty-stricken employments. *S.]*

² ['It is more probable, that the principal design of this massacre was to recover the provinces of Thrace, Macedon, and Achaia, which, in the divisions of the empire, Constantine the Great had given to young Dalmatius, son of his brother of the same name; and Pontus and Cappadocia, which he had granted to Annibalianus, the brother of young Dalmatius. Be that as it will, Mosheim has attributed this massacre equally to the three sons of Constantine; whereas almost all authors agree, that neither young Constantine, nor Constans, had any hand in it at all.' *MacL.*]

³ [Because they were despised: Gallus, being sickly, it was supposed would not live long; and Julian, being but eight years old, created no fear. Some years after, they were sent to a remote place in Cappadocia, where they were instructed in languages, the sciences, and gymnastics, being in a sense kept prisoners; and were at last designed for the clerical office, having been made lecturers or readers. Ammianus Marcell. xxii. 9. *Schl.*]

No one of these brothers possessed the disposition or the discernment of their father; yet they all pursued their father's purpose of abolishing the ancient superstitions of the Romans, and other pagans, and of propagating the Christian religion throughout the Roman empire. The thing itself was commendable and excellent; but in the means employed there was much to censure.¹

§ 12. The cause of Christianity, which had been thus flourishing and prosperous, received immense injury, and seemed on the brink of ruin, when *Julian*, the son of *Julius Constantius*, brother of *Constantine* the Great, now the only surviving branch of the Constantinian family,² after a successful campaign in Gaul, A. D. 360, was hailed emperor by his soldiers, and on the death of *Constantius*, A. D. 361, obtained possession of the whole empire. This credulous and vain-glorious prince was, indeed, educated in the Christian religion, but he spurned it; partly from hatred of the Constantinian family, which had slain his father, brother, and others of his race; partly from the cunning of the Platonic philosophers, who imposed upon him with fictitious miracles and prophecies. He took up in its place the principles of his ancestors, and strove to reinstate the rites of paganism in all their former splendour. *Julian* seemed to abhor all violence, and to leave his people full discretion in religion and its outward forms; but he really cut, by art and policy, the sinews of the Christian cause. He abrogated privileges granted as well to that religion itself as to its principal officers, closed its schools of philosophy and liberal arts, not only tolerated all its opponents, but also inspired and favoured them in writing books against the Christians, and in other things. He had more objects in contemplation, and would, doubtless, have done immense harm to Christianity, if he had returned victorious from the Persian war, which he undertook directly after he came to the throne. But in this war, which was both undertaken and carried on with little discretion, he fell by a wound received in battle, A. D. 363, when just entered on the thirty-second year of his age, and after reigning sole emperor only twenty months from the death of *Constantius*.³

¹ [Coercive measures were adopted, which only made nominal Christians. A law was enacted, in 342, that all the heathen temples should be shut up; and that no person should be allowed to go near them. All sacrifices, and all consultations of the oracles and soothsayers, were prohibited, on pain of death and confiscation of property: and the provincial magistrates were threatened with the same penalties, if they were dilatory in punishing transgressors of the law. This was to compel the conscience, and not to convince it: The history of these emperors may be found in the *Universal History*, and in *Le Beau's History of the Eastern Empire*. *Schl.*—Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. 18 and 19. *Ed.*]

² [For Gallus, who had been created

Cæsar, was previously murdered by order of *Constantius*, because of his cruelty, and being charged with aspiring after the supreme power. *Ammian. Marcell. xiv. 11. Schl.*]

³ See, besides *Tillemont* [the *Universal History*; *Le Beau, Histoire du bas Empire*, tom. iii. liv. xii—xiv.] and other common writers, the accurately written work of *Bletterie, Vie de Julien*, Paris, 1734, and *Amsterd. 1735*, 8vo; the *Life and Character of Julian the Apostate, illustrated in VII. Dissertations*, by *Des Voeux*, Dublin, 1746, 8vo; *Ez. Spanheim, Preface and Notes to the Works of Julian*, Lips. 1696, fol.; and *Joh. Alb. Fabricius, Lux salutaris Evangelii*, &c., cap. xiv. p. 294, &c. [Add *Aug. Neander, über Kayser Julianus und sein Zeitalter*, Hamb. 1812, 8vo. *Tr.*]

§ 13. Those who rank *Julian* among the greatest heroes of any age, nay, place him first among all who ever filled a throne, which now many do, they too persons learned and acute,¹ are either hin-

¹ Montesquieu, *Esprit des Loix*, xxiv. 10, says: *Il n'y a point eu après lui de prince plus digne de gouverner des hommes.* [To form a correct judgment of Julian, it is necessary cursorily to survey the history of his life. He was born A. D. 331; and lost his mother Basilina the same year; and his father, Julius Constantius, a few years after. Mardonius, a eunuch, and Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, were his first instructors. When Gallus was made a Cæsar, Julian obtained permission to come to Constantinople, where he attended the public schools; then he went to Bithynia, everywhere attaching himself to the most noted teachers; and read and imitated the orations of Libanius, a pagan sophist, whom he was strictly forbidden to hear. At Pergamus he became acquainted with Ædesius, an aged Platonic philosopher, and heard his scholars, Eusebius and Chrysanthus, as also Maximus of Ephesus, who initiated him in theurgia, brought him to apostatise from Christianity, and presaged his elevation to the throne. This change in his religion he was obliged to conceal from Constantius and Gallus. He therefore devoted himself to a monastic life, assumed the tonsure, and became a public reader in the church at Nicomedia. In 354, after the death of Gallus, he was deprived of his liberty, and carried to Milan. After being in custody there seven months, he obtained, by the intercession of the empress Eusebia, a release, and liberty to travel into Greece, where he applied himself, at Athens, to the sciences and to eloquence, and became acquainted with Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus. In 355, he was proclaimed Cæsar, and had Gaul, Spain, and Britain intrusted to him. But Constantius greatly limited his power, and nominated not only the military commanders there, but also the officers of Julian's court who were to keep strict watch over him. To this his elevation Eusebia contributed much, she being anxious about the succession to the throne, on account of her continued barrenness: and the rebellion of Sylvanus, which took place in the beginning of this year, as also the continual incursions of the bordering nations, which required a general in Gaul, favoured the measure. Julian performed some successful campaigns in Gaul, which procured him the affections not only of the soldiery, but likewise of all the Gallic subjects. This awakened the jealousy of Constantius, who, under pretext of the Persian war, recalled a great part of the troops from Gaul. In the spring of 360, the soldiers

proclaimed Julian Augustus, and compelled him to assume that dignity. A reconciliation was attempted in vain. Constantius insisted upon it, that Julian should resign. Julian prosecuted the German war successfully, and strengthened and fortified the frontiers; and after vanquishing the Germans, whom Constantius had excited against him, and subduing Illyricum and Italy, he marched unencumbered against Constantius, who came forward to meet him, but was taken sick on the way, and died in Cilicia. Julian now took quiet possession of the whole Roman empire; caused Constantius to be honourably buried; but called his principal officers to account, before a special court, as the authors of numerous acts of violence. He likewise attempted great reforms in the court, in which prodigality and pomp had risen to a great height. He also dismissed many useless officers; and filled his court with philosophers and soothsayers, to whom he showed particular respect. During the Illyrian campaign, in 361, he publicly sacrificed to the gods; and after the death of Constantius, he let it be distinctly known, that it was his purpose to reinstate idolatrous worship. But, as he was aware of the ill consequences which formerly resulted from direct persecution, and wished to avoid the repetition of them, and coveted the reputation of being magnanimous and benevolent, and as, in prospect of his Persian campaign, he stood in fear of the numerous body of Christians, he endeavoured to assail and to undermine them by artifice. For this purpose, he adopted the following measures. *First*, he endeavoured to reform the pagan idolatry, and to introduce improvements in it derived from the Christian worship. With this view, he attended to his official duties as *Pontifex Maximus*, with more earnestness than any of his predecessors; and even treated them as of more consequence than the government of the empire. He offered sacrifices daily in his palace and garden; attended the public sacrifices on all the pagan festivals, and officiated personally in them, without the least regard to decorum, even as to the meanest service. He re-established the public sacrifices of the cities and provinces. Where there were no temples, or where the destroyers of the ancient temples could not be found, or were his own predecessors, there he erected temples at his own cost, and gave to the idolatrous priests high rank and large revenues. As he had been converted to paganism by philosophers, who were of the new Platonic school, and who

dered by their prepossessions from seeing the truth, or have never read attentively his writings which remain, or lastly, do not know what really deserves the name of great and excellent. If we set aside genius, which his writings, however, show him to have possessed but moderately, military courage, love of letters, acquaintance with that senseless and useless philosophy called later Platonism, and, lastly, patience of labour, all other things in *Julian* are unquestionably little and unworthy of commendation. His excellences were counterbalanced by very great defects; first, a monstrous and almost anile superstition, the surest indication of a petty mind; then, a puerile hankering after glory and vulgar popularity, extreme credulity and instability, a proneness to cunning and artifice; finally,

held much to theurgia, magic, divination, and apparitions, and were willing to borrow from Christianity, hence originated many burdensome purifications, and prolix ceremonies of worship, together with a considerable aping of Christian institutions. He was strenuous for the virtuous behaviour, the morality and beneficence, of the priests; and he forbade their going to theatres, or having much intercourse with those in civil authority. He wished to place the reading of useful books, giving public exhortations, and taking care of the poor, the sick, and funerals, on the same footing as they were among the Christians: and he required, that the priests in many places should annually be supplied with corn, and wine, and money, which they were to distribute to the poor. *Secondly*, he supported and extended more widely the internal divisions among the Christians. For he restored all silenced and ejected teachers, and required that such parties as had been laid under ecclesiastical censures, should be reinstated in their privileges. He wrote letters to the most noted and restless heretics, and encouraged them to disseminate their doctrines. He allowed the leading members of the different parties to come to him, and, under colour of attempting to reconcile their differences, he inflamed them more against each other. *Thirdly*, he deprived the clergy of the franchises and permanent incomes which they had enjoyed under the former emperors; especially of their exemption from burdensome civil duties, and of the distribution of corn to the churches from the emperor's storehouses; and he compelled the monks and the ministers of religion, by force, to perform military duty. *Fourthly*, he excluded the Christians from all promotions, and in terms of bitter sarcasm forbade their access to the public schools, their studying the Greek authors and sciences, and their practising physic. *Fifthly*, he commanded the idolatrous temples, images, and altars, to be rebuilt, at the cost of those who had pulled them down. *Sixthly*, acts of violence

done by pagans to Christians, he either did not punish at all, or punished very slightly, only requiring them to make restitution. On the contrary, every tumult among Christians was punished most severely; and commonly, the bishops and the churches were made accountable for them. *Seventhly*, he connected idolatry with all solemn transactions, and with the manifestations of respect due to himself, and made a participation in it unavoidable. The soldiers, for instance, when extraordinary gratuities were presented them, must strew incense upon an altar; and to all the publicly exhibited pictures of the emperor, idolatrous deities were attached. *Eighthly*, he ridiculed the Christians and their worship scornfully; and wrote books in confutation of their doctrines. His work against Christianity, which was composed in the year 363, and in part during his Persian campaign, is lost. Indeed, the Marquis d'Argens, in the *Défense du Paganisme, par l'Empereur Julien, en Grec et François, avec des Dissertations et Notes*, Berlin, 1764, 8vo, has endeavoured to recover this work, by means of the confutation of it by Cyril. But the recovery is very incomplete. Yet these remains of it show, that the book was more likely to injure Christianity, by the style in which it was written, and by the perversion of Scripture, than by either the strength or the originality of its arguments and objections. *Ninthly*, and lastly, the emperor showed much partiality to the Jews, and allowed them to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, in order to confute by facts the prediction of Christ. Immediately after, there were banishments, tortures, and executions of Christians, under pretence that they had shown themselves refractory against the commands of the emperor; and there were many, especially in the eastern provinces, who became apostates. Yet there were not wanting resolute confessors to the Christian religion. See Baumgarten's *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* ii. 763, 780, 792, &c. *Schl.*]

ignorance of solid and sound philosophy. I will grant that, in some respects, he was superior to the *sons* of Constantine the Great; but in many ways was he inferior to *Constantine himself*, whom he disparages without measure.

§ 14. As *Julian* affected an appearance of indisposition to trouble any citizen on a religious account, and professed hostility to no sect whatever, he showed so much indulgence to the Jews, as to give them liberty to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. The Jews commenced the work, but were obliged to desist before even the foundations were laid. For balls of fire issued from the ground, accompanied with a great explosion and a tremendous earthquake, which dispersed both the materials that were collected and the workmen. The fact itself is abundantly attested;¹ though the Christians, as often happens in such cases, appear to have amplified it, inconsiderately, with some additional miracles. As to the causes which produced the event, there is room for debate, and there *is* debate. All, however, who weigh the subject with an impartial mind, will easily perceive, that they must join with those who ascribe the phenomenon to the omnipotent will of God; and that they who choose to ascribe it to natural causes, or to artifice and fraud, offer no objections which are insurmountable.²

§ 15. The soldiers elected *Jovian* to succeed *Julian*. He died in the year 364, after reigning seven months; and, therefore, accomplished but little.³ The other emperors of this century who reigned

¹ See Joh. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, p. 124, where the testimonies are collected. See also the acute English knight, Walter Moyle, *Posthumous Works*, p. 101, &c. [The principal authorities cited by Fabricius are, Chrysostom, *Homil. v. adv. Judæos*, et alibi sæpius; Ammianus Marcell. xxiii. 1; Gregory Naz. *Orat. iv.*; Ambrose, *Ep. 40* (al. 29, written A.D. 388); Socrates, *H. E. iii. 20*; Sozomen, *H. E. v. 21*; Theodoret, *H. E. iii. 20*; Rufinus, *H. E. i. 37*; Philostorgius, *H. E. vii. 9, 14*; *Hist. Eccles. Tripartita*, vi. 43; Nicephorus, *x. 32*; Zonaras, xiii. 12; Rabbi David Gantz, *Zemach David*, pt. ii. p. 36; Rabbi Gedaliah, *Schalschelet Hakkabala*, p. 109.—Dr. Lardner (*Collection of Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, iv. 57—71, ed. Lond. 1767) maintains the whole story to be false. His chief arguments are, that Julian only *purposed* to rebuild the temple, *after* his Persian expedition; that he needed all his resources for that expedition; the silence of *some* of the fathers, living near the time; and the decorations of the story by others of them. But these arguments seem wholly insufficient, against the explicit testimony of so many credible witnesses, Christians and pagans, and several of them contemporary with the event. *Tr.*]

² Ja. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, iv. 1257, &c., contests the reality of this miracle.

Against him appeared Gisb. Cuperus, in his *Epistolæ*, p. 400, edited by Bayer. Recently, Wm. Warburton has maintained the reality of the miracle, with an excess of ingenuity, in an appropriate treatise, entitled: *Julian, or a Discourse concerning the earthquake and fiery eruption, which defeated that emperor's attempt to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem*; London, 1750, 8vo.

³ See Bletterie, *Vie de Jovien*, 2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1748, in which work he completes the history of Julian, and gives a French translation of some of Julian's writings. [Both during the lifetime of Julian, and after his death, when the soldiers made him emperor, Jovian openly declared himself on the side of Christianity. For when Julian gave orders to all the military officers who were Christians, either to quit the army, or renounce their religion, Jovian chose to relinquish his office. But Julian would not release him, but gave him promotion during the Persian war. When chosen emperor, Jovian would not accept the office, until the army had declared themselves in favour of Christianity. When he arrived at Antioch, he repealed all the laws of Julian, adverse to Christianity (Rufinus, xi. 1, and Sozomen, vi. 3), and wrote to all the provincial governors, commanding them to take diligent care, that the Christians should not be disturbed in their public assemblies. He restored to the

after *Jovian* were *Valentinian I.*,¹ *Valens*, then *Gratian*,² *Valentinian II.* [*Theodosius*], *Honorius*.³ All these were Christians who deserved well of the religion which they professed, and endeavoured, though not with equal zeal, to extirpate wholly the heathen rites. In this particular, *Theodosius* the Great, the last emperor of this century, exceeded all the rest. He came to the throne A. D. 379, and died A. D. 395. So long as he lived, no means were left untried, within his power, to overthrow idolatry through all the Roman provinces, and severe laws were enacted by him against adherents to it. The same design was prosecuted by his sons *Arcadius* and *Honorius*; so that, as the century declined, all hope and credit of the ancient superstition wore away.⁴

§ 16. No such severity was, however, used, as prevented fanes and ceremonies from continuing to a great extent, especially in the remoter provinces. Indeed, these rigorous laws against worshippers of the pagan deities seem to have been aimed rather against the common people, than against persons of rank and distinction. For it appears, that during the reign of *Theodosius*, as well as after his death, men filled the highest offices, and continued in them till old age, who are known to have been averse from Christianity, and attached to paganism. Of this *Libanius* is an example, who was very hostile to the Christians, and yet was made præfect of the prætorium by *Theodosius* himself. Perhaps greater indulgence was shown to philosophers, rhetoricians, and military commanders, than to other people, on account of their supposed usefulness to the commonwealth.

§ 17. Yet these very rhetoricians and philosophers, whose schools were supposed to be so profitable to the community, exhausted all their ingenuity, both before the days of *Constantine* the Great, and afterwards, to arrest the progress of Christianity. In the beginning of this century, *Hierocles*, the great ornament of the Platonic school, composed two books against the Christians; in which he had the audacity to compare our Saviour with *Apollonius Tyanceus*, and for which he was chastised by *Eusebius*, in a tract written expressly against him.⁵ *Lactantius* speaks of another philosopher, who

churches the clergy, and to widows all the franchises and privileges which had been granted them by *Constantine* and his sons, but which *Julian* had taken from them. He likewise restored the use of the *Labarum*, or the standard with a cross; and he compelled one *Magnus* to rebuild the church of *Berytus*, at his own cost, he having commanded it to be demolished. *Theodoret*, iv. 19. In regard to the religious controversies of that day, he joined with the orthodox against the *Arians*; and he treated *Athanasius* with peculiar respect. See *Baumgarten's Auszug der Kirchenhistorie*, ii. 805, and the *Universal History*. *Schl.*

¹ [In the West, from A. D. 364—375, with *Valens* in the East, from A. D. 364—378. *Tr.*]

² [In the West, A. D. 375—383, with *Valentinian II.* also in the West, A. D. 375—392, and *Theodosius the Great* in the East, A. D. 379—395. *Tr.*]

³ [In the West, A. D. 395—423, with *Arcadius*, in the East, A. D. 395—408. *Tr.*]

⁴ See the laws of these emperors, in favour of the Christian religion, and against the professors and friends of the ancient religion, in the *Codex Theodosianus*, t. vi., and *Peter and Jerome Ballerini*, Diss. i. in *Zenonem Veronensem*, p. 45, &c. *Veronæ*, 1739, fol.

⁵ [*Hierocles*, who flourished about A. D. 303, was governor of *Bithynia*, and afterwards præfect of *Egypt*. His character and books are thus described by *Lactantius*,

endeavoured, in three books, to convince the Christians of error; but his name is not mentioned.¹ After the reign of *Constantine* the Great, besides *Julian*, who wrote a large volume against the Christians, *Himerius*² and *Libanius*,³ in their public declamations, and *Eunapius*, in his lives of the philosophers, zealously decried the Christian religion.⁴ Yet no one of these persons was punished for licentiousness of tongue or pen.

§ 18. How much harm was done to the Christian cause by these sophists or philosophers, inflated with a conceit of their own knowledge, and with hatred of the Christian name, appears from many examples in this century, and especially from *Julian*, who was seduced by such men. Among those who would pass for the wiser sort,

Institut. Divinar. l. v. c. 2, 3. 'He was one of the judges, and was the principal author of the persecution [under Diocletian]. But not content with this crime, he also attacked with his pen the people he persecuted: for he composed two books—not against the Christians, lest he should seem to address them as an enemy—but to the Christians, that he might appear friendly to them and anxious for their good. In these books he endeavours to prove the falsehood of the Scriptures, by making them appear full of contradictions.'—'He particularly assailed Peter and Paul and the other disciples, as disseminators of falsehood; and he accuses them of being rude and illiterate persons, because some of them had lived by fishing.'—'He affirms, that Christ was outlawed by the Jews; and that he afterwards collected a company of 900 banditti and became a robber.'—'Also, wishing to overthrow his miracles (which he does not pretend to deny), he attempts to show that Apollonius had performed as great, and even greater.'—'I do not say (he adds) that the reason why Apollonius was never accounted a god was, that he chose not to be so regarded: but I say that we are wiser—in not attaching at once the idea of divinity to the working of miracles—than you are, who believe a person a god merely on account of a few wonderful acts.'—'Having poured out such crudities of his ignorance, and having laboured utterly to extirpate the truth, he has the temerity to entitle his nefarious books, which are hostile to God, *devoted to the truth*' (φιλαληθείς).—Eusebius, *Liber contra Hieroclem*, Gr. and Lat., subjoined to his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, ed. Paris, 1628.—See Lardner's Works, vol. viii. and Bayle, *Dictionnaire Histor. et Crit.* art. *Hierocles* (2nd.). Tr.]

¹ Lactantius, *Institut. Divinar.* v. 2.

² See Photius, *Biblioth.* cod. clxv. p. 355. [The works of Himerius are lost. Tr.]

³ [Libanius, the sophist, was born at Antioch about A.D. 314, and lived probably till about the end of the century. He

taught rhetoric at Nice, Nicomedia, Constantinople, Athens, and Antioch. His schools were large, sometimes amounting to more than eighty pupils; and rival sophists envied him. The emperor Julian, when young, was forbidden to attend the school of Libanius; but he obtained and read his writings, and made them his model as to style. When Julian came to the throne, he offered Libanius a public office, which the sophist proudly refused. Yet the emperor and he were very good friends. Libanius was an inflated, pedantic man, full of himself, yet independent in his feelings, and free in the expression of his opinions. He was an avowed pagan, yet a strenuous advocate for religious toleration. His numerous writings still remain, consisting of a prolix Life of himself, a large number of eulogies and declamations, and more than a thousand letters. They seldom contain either profound or original thought, or display research: and the style is concise, affected, and pedantic. Yet they are of some use, to throw light on the times in which he lived. They were published, Gr. and Lat. vol. i. Paris, 1606, and vol. ii. by Morell, 1627, fol. The most complete edition of his Epistles, is by Wolf, Amsterdam, 1738, fol. A volume, containing seventeen of his Declamations, was published at Venice, 1755. See his *Life*, written by himself, in his Works, ii. 1—84. Eunapius, *Vite Philos. et Sophistarum*, p. 130, &c., and among the moderns, Tillemont, *Histoire des Empereurs*, iv. 571, &c. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vii. 376—414. Lardner, *Heathen Testimonies*, iv. 127—163, and Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Rom. Emp.* ch. xxiv. Tr.]

⁴ [See Eunapius, *Lives of Aedesius, Maximus, &c.* Eunapius also wrote a chronicle, to which he frequently refers in his *Lives of the Sophists*, the first edition of which is full of reproaches against the Christians and Constantine the Great; the second edition is more temperate. Both editions were extant in the times of Photius: see his *Biblioth.* codex lxxvii. *Schl.*]

desirous to avoid extremes, many were induced, by the arguments and explanations of these men, to devise a kind of intermediate religion, made up of the old superstition and Christianity, persuading themselves that it was the very thing enjoined by Christ, and that it had long been hidden by the pagan priests under the veil of ceremonies and fables. Of these views were *Ammianus Marcellinus*, a very prudent and discreet man,¹ *Chalcidius*, a philosopher,² *Themistius*, a very celebrated orator,³ and others, who conceived that both religions were in unison, as to all the more important points, if they were rightly understood; and therefore held, that *Christ* was neither to be contemned, nor to be honoured to the exclusion of the pagan deities.⁴

§ 19. As *Constantine* the Great, with his sons and successors, took much pains to enlarge the Christian church, it is not strange that many nations, before barbarous and uncivilised, became subject to *Christ*.⁵ Several circumstances make it probable, that the light of Christianity cast some of its rays into both Armenias, the greater and the less, soon after the establishment of the Christian church.⁶ But

¹ [Ammianus Marcellinus, a Latin historian, of Greek descent, was a soldier, for at least twenty years, from A.D. 350 onwards, in the honourable corps called *Protectores Domestici*. On retiring from military life, he settled at Rome, where he lived perhaps till the end of the century. There he composed his history, in thirty-one books, from the accession of Nerva (where Suetonius ends) to the death of Valens. The first thirteen books are lost. The last eighteen include the period from A.D. 353—378. The style is harsh and unpolished, and sometimes difficult; but the fidelity and accuracy of the narration render the work highly valuable. Marcellinus was probably a *real pagan*; but he was not a bigot, and he was willing to give every one his due, according to his best judgment. The best editions are, that of Valesius, republished by Gronovius, Leyden, 1693, fol. and 4to, and that of Ernesti, Lips. 1775, 8vo. See Bayle, *Dictionnaire Histor. et Crit.* art. *Marcellin.* Tr.]

² [Chalcidius, a philosopher of the fourth century, wrote a Latin translation of the *Timæus* of Plato, and of a commentary on it, at the suggestion (as is reported) of Hosius of Corduba, published by J. Meursius, Lugd. Bat. 1617, 4to. Mosheim's opinion of his religious faith is developed in his *Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia*, § 31, and in his notes on Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, i. 732, &c. J. A. Fabricius (in his notes on Chalcidius, passim; and in his *Biblioth. Latina*, iii. 7, p. 557, &c.), and some others, hold that Chalcidius was a pagan. — Brucker (*Hist. Crit. Philos.* iii. 472, &c.) makes him a Christian, though infected with the new Platonism of his

age. Tr. Some make him archdeacon of Carthage. See Cave, *Hist. Litt. Ed.*]

³ [Themistius, a Greek philosopher of Paphlagonia, called Euphrades (the fine speaker), was made a Roman senator, and enjoyed the favour of Constantius, Julian, and the succeeding emperors, down to Theodosius the Great, who made him prefect of Constantinople, and appointed him tutor to Arcadius. He wrote, when young, some commentaries on Aristotle, fragments of which are extant, and thirty-three of his Orations. His works are best edited by Harduin, Paris, 1684, fol. He was a strenuous advocate for the free toleration of all religions, as being all good, and tending to the same result by different ways. Concerning him and his religious views, see Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 484, &c. Tr.]

⁴ [This favourite opinion Mosheim defends more at length, in his *Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia*, § 30—32; among his *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes*, i. 85—216, Altonæ, 1733. But it seems not necessary to adopt this hypothesis, which has but slender support from argument; because the Eclectic or new Platonic philosophy might easily lead its votaries to speak in terms of moderation, and even of commendation, of the Christian religion, especially in an age when it prevailed almost universally, and was the religion of the state and of the imperial court. Tr.]

⁵ Gaudentius, *Vita Philastrii*, § iii. Philastrius, *de Hæres.* Præf. p. 5, ed. Fabricii. Socrates, *H. E.* i. 19. Georgius Cedrenus, *Chronograph.* p. 234, ed. Paris; and others.

⁶ [For Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 46) informs us that Dionysius of Alexandria, about the

the Armenian church first received due organisation and firm establishment in this century; in the beginning of which, *Gregory*, the son of Anax, commonly called the *Illuminator*, because he dispelled the mists of superstition which beclouded the minds of the Armenians, first persuaded some private individuals, and afterwards *Tiridates*, the king of the Armenians, as well as his nobles, to embrace the Christian religion. He was, therefore, ordained the first bishop of Armenia, by *Leontius*, bishop of [Cæsarea, in] Cappadocia, and gradually diffused the principles of Christianity throughout that country.¹

§ 20. In the middle of this century, one *Frumentius* proceeded from Egypt into the neighbouring country of Abyssinia or Ethiopia, the inhabitants of which were called *Auxumitæ*, from their capital city *Auxuma*, and baptized both the king of the country, and very many of the nobles. Afterwards returning to Egypt, he was consecrated by *St. Athanasius*, first bishop of the Auxumitæ. From this circumstance, the Ethiopic church, even to this day, is dependent on that of Alexandria, and receives its bishop from it.² In *Iberia*, a province of Asia which is now called *Georgia*, a Christian woman who had been carried captive into that country, partly by the sanctity of her life, and partly by miracles, induced the king and his queen to renounce idolatry and embrace *Christ*, and also to send for priests from Constantinople, from whom they and their people might gain a more accurate and complete knowledge of the Christian religion.³

§ 21. A part of the *Goths*, inhabiting Thrace, Mœsia, and Dacia,⁴ had embraced Christianity before the commencement of this century; ⁵ and *Theophilus* their bishop was present at the Nicene council.⁶ *Constantine* the Great, after having vanquished them and the Sarmatians, engaged great numbers of them to become Christians.⁷ But still a large part of the nation remained estranged from *Christ*, until the times of the emperor *Valens*, who permitted them to pass the river Ister,⁸ and to inhabit Dacia, Mœsia, and Thrace, on condition that they would be subject to the Roman laws, and would embrace Christianity; to which condition their king *Fritigern* consented.⁹ The bishop of the Goths inhabiting Mœsia in this century, was the much celebrated *Ulphilas*; who, among other

year 260, 'wrote concerning *penance*, to the Brethren of Armenia, over whom Meruzanes was bishop;' and, according to the *Acta Martyrum*, some Armenians suffered martyrdom in the persecutions under Decius (A. D. 250) and Diocletian (A. D. 304). *Tr.*]

¹ See *Narratio de Rebus Armeniæ*, in Fr. Combesii, *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr. Græcor.* ii. 287, &c. Mich. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 419 and 1356. J. J. Schröderi *Thesaur. Linguae Armenicæ*, p. 149, &c.

² Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium*, Opp. t. i. pt. ii. p. 315, ed. Benedict. Socrates, *H. E.* i. 49. Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 24. Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 23. Job Ludolf, *Comment. ad Histor. Æthiopic.* p. 281. Jerome Lobo,

Voyage d'Abissinie, ii. 13, &c. Justus Fontaninus, *Historia Litterar. Aquileiæ*, p. 174. [Neale, *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, i. 156. *Ed.*]

³ Rufinus, *H. E.* i. 10. Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 7. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 1333, &c.

⁴ [Now the north-east part of Rumelia, with Bulgaria and Wallachia, on the Danube. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Philostorgius, *H. E.* ii. 5. *Schl.*]

⁶ [Harduin, *Conc.* i. 319. *Schl.*]

⁷ Socrates, *H. E.* i. 18.

⁸ [Or Danube. *Tr.*]

⁹ Socrates, *H. E.* iv. 33. Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 1240. Eric Benzell, *Præf.*

laudable deeds, gave his countrymen an alphabet of his own invention, and translated the Bible for them into the Gothic language.¹

§ 22. In the European provinces of the Roman empire, there still remained a vast number of idolaters; and though the Christian bishops endeavoured to convert them to *Christ*, the business went on but slowly. In Gaul the great *Martin*, bishop of Tours, was not unsuccessful in this work; for, travelling through the provinces of Gaul, he, by his discourses and by his miracles (if we may believe *Sulpitius Severus*), everywhere persuaded many to renounce their idols and embrace *Christ*; he destroyed also the temples of the gods, and threw down their statues.² He therefore merited the title of the *Apostle of the Gauls*.

ad IV. Evangelia Gothica (ascribed to Ulphilas), c. v. p. xviii. &c. ed. Oxon. 1750, 4to.

¹ Joh. Jac. Mascovii *Historia Germanor.* i. 317, ii. Note, p. 49. *Acta Sanctor.* March, iii. p. 619. Eric Benzel, *loc. cit.* cap. viii. p. xxx. [J. C. Zahn, *Einleitung in Ulfilas Bibelübersetzung*, p. 4, &c. ed. Weissenfels, 1805, 4to, where is condensed all that is stated of Ulphilas, and his translation, by the ancients, viz. Philostorgius, *H. E.* ii. 5. Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 41, and iv. 33. Sozomen, *H. E.* iv. 24, vi. 37. Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 37, and others. Ulphilas (or *Ulfila*, *Urphilas*, *Gilfulas*, &c. but should, according to Jormandes, be written *Wulfila*, i.e. *Wölflein*, diminutive of *Wulf* or *Wolf*, a wolf) is said, by Philostorgius, to have descended from Christian Greeks of Sadagoltina in Cappadocia, who were carried into captivity by the Goths in 266. [He was born in 311 among the Goths on the left of the Danube, and the Gothic was his native language. About 326 he led his Goths into the empire: in 328, he became a Reader at Constantinople; and was consecrated bishop by Eusebius of Nicomedia in 341. Having preached for seven years to his countrymen, and being with the Thervingi under the West-Gothic king Fritiger, who was at war with the Grentthingi under the East-Gothic Athanaric, he was compelled with his flock to cross the Danube, and allowed by Constantine to settle in *solo Romanie* in 348. He was an Arian, and attended two synods at Constantinople in 360 and 388. He died in the same year at Constantinople. *Ed.*] He had great influence in Dacia, Mæsia, and Thrace, and was twice sent on embassies by his nation to the imperial court. His last embassy was in the reign of Valens, A.D. 376, to obtain permission for the Goths to pass the Danube and settle in Mæsia. He was successful; and 200,000 Goths were admitted into the Roman empire, on condition of obeying the Roman laws and joining the Arian interest. He was succeeded in his episcopal office by Theotimus, or, as some

report, by Selinas. He was author of a translation of the whole Bible, except the books of Kings, from Greek into the language of the Goths of Mæsia. The books of Kings were omitted by him, lest their history of wars and battles should inflame the already too great thirst of the Goths for war and carnage. The alphabet he used was of his own devising, and formed chiefly from the Greek and Latin. Nothing remains of this translation, except a single copy, somewhat mutilated, of the four Gospels, called the *Codex Argenteus*, because written in letters of silver, now at Upsal in Sweden; and a few fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, recovered from an erasure of a MS. of the eighth or ninth century. Ulphilas's Gospels were first published by Fr. Junius, Dort, 1665, 2 vols. 4to; at Stockholm, 1671, 4to; and very learnedly, Oxford, 1750, fol.; and by J. C. Zahn, Weissenfels, 1805, 4to, with a complete Apparatus in the German language. *Tr.*—By A. Uppeström, Upsal, 1854; by H. F. Mässon, 1855. In 1818, Cardinal Mai discovered some more fragments at Bobbio. See M. Müller's *Lectures on Language*, p. 173—175, and for the life of Ulfilas, the same work, third edition, p. 179—184. *Ed.*]

² See Sulpitius Severus, *Dial. i. de Vita Martini*, c. 13, 15, 17. *Dial. ii.* p. 106, &c. ed. Hier. a Prato, Verona, 1741, fol.—[Martin was born in Sabaria, in Pannonia, and brought up at Pavia. He embraced Christianity contrary to the will of his parents; and after following the occupation of his father in the army, committed himself to the instruction of Hilary of Poitiers. From the Arians he suffered much persecution; and he was principally instrumental in the introduction of monasticism among the Gauls. [He was ordained bishop of Tours, A.D. 374, and died in 397, aged 81.] See his biographer, Sulpitius Severus; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. x.; and the *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, t. i. pt. ii. p. 413. *Schl.*—The English reader may consult Milner's *Church History*, cent. iv. ch. 14. *Tr.*]

§ 23. It is very evident that not only the victories of *Constantine* the Great, but also fear of punishment, and desire to please the Roman emperors, served for arguments with whole nations, as well as individuals, in embracing the Christian religion. Yet no person well informed in the history of this period, will ascribe the extension of Christianity wholly to these causes. For it is manifest that the untiring zeal of the bishops and other holy men, the pure and devout lives which many of the Christians exhibited, the translations of the sacred volume, and the excellence of the Christian religion, were as efficient motives with many persons, as the arguments from worldly advantage and disadvantage were with some others. As for miracles, I cheerfully unite with those who look with contempt on the wonders ascribed to *Paul*, *Antony*, and *Martin*.¹ I also grant that many events were inconsiderately regarded as miracles, which are according to the laws of nature; not to mention likewise pious frauds. Still I cannot join with such as believe that, in this age, God did never manifest his power by any extraordinary sign among Christians.²

§ 24. Although, from the time of *Constantine* the Great, no heavier calamity befell the Christian church within the Roman empire, than the commotion of *Licinius*, and *Julian's* brief reign, yet a slight storm sometimes beat upon it in particular places. *Athanasius*, king of the Goths, for instance, fiercely assailed for a time that portion of the Gothic nation which had embraced Christianity.³ In the more remote provinces, also, the adherents to idolatry often defended their hereditary superstitions with the sword, and murdered the Christians, who, in propagating their religion, were not always as gentle or as prudent as they ought to have been.⁴ Beyond the limits of the Roman empire, *Sapor II.*, surnamed *Longævus*, king of Persia, waged three bloody wars against the Christians in his dominions. The *first* was in the eighteenth year of his reign;⁵ the *second* was in the thirtieth year; and the *third*, which was the most cruel, and destroyed an immense number of Christians, commenced in his thirty-first year, A. D. 330, and lasted forty years, or till A. D. 370. Yet religion was not the ostensible cause of this dreadful persecution, but a suspicion of treasonable practices among the Christians: for the Magi and

¹ Hieron. a Prato, in his preface to Sulpitius Severus, p. xiii. &c., contends zealously for the miracles of Martin and the others in this century. [An account of the miracles of St. Martin may be found in Sulpit. Sever. *Vita Martini*; and *Epistles* i.—iii. and *Dialogues* ii. iii. The miracles of some contemporary monks of Egypt and the East, are the subject of Dialogue i. For the history of Paul, see Jerome, *de Vita Sti Pauli Eremitæ*, in his *Opp.* i.; and for that of Antony, see Athanasius, *de Vita Sti Antonii Eremitæ*, in his *Opp.* ii.; ed. Paris, 1627. Tr.]

² See Eusebius, *Liber contra Hieroclem*, c. iv. p. 431, ed. Olearii; Henr. Dodwell, *Diss. II. in Irenæum*, § lv. p. 195, [also

Conyers Middleton's *Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers which are said to have subsisted in the Christian Church*, &c., Lond. 1747, 4to; and in defence of miracles, Dr. Wm. Dodwell's *Answer to Dr. Middleton's Free Inquiry*, &c. 1751, 8vo. and Church's *Vindication of the Miraculous Power*, in answer to Middleton, 1750, 8vo, likewise Dr. J. Jortin's *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. ed. Lond. 1805. Tr.]

³ See Theod. Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum sincera*; and among these, the *Acta Sti Sabæ*, p. 598, &c.

⁴ See Ambrose, *de Officiis*, lib. i. c. xlii. § 17; where is a noticeable statement.

⁵ [A. D. 317. Tr.]

the Jews persuaded the king, not only that all Christians wished well to the Roman empire, but also that *Symeon*, archbishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, sent to Constantinople intelligence of everything that passed in Persia.¹

¹ See Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 1—13 [where is a full account]. These Persian persecutions are expressly treated of in the *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* i. 6, 16, 181, and iii. 52. &c.; with which, however, should be compared, Steph. Euod. Asseman, *Præf.*

ad Acta Martyrum Oriental. et Occidental. splendidly edited, Rome, 1748, 2 vols. fol. p. lxxi. &c. He has published the *Martyrologium Persicum*, in Syriac, with a Latin translation, and excellent Notes.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

- § 1. State of literature — § 2. Progress of the Platonic philosophy — § 3. Its fate —
§ 4. State of learning among Christians — § 5. Many illiterate Christians.

§ 1. THOSE of this century, whether Greeks or Romans, who sought a character for scholarship, gave their attention to polite literature, eloquence in every branch, and history. Nor is it a few that can be named of either nation, who from these studies gained applause. But all fell very short of the highest excellence. The best of these poets, as *Ausonius*,¹ if compared with those of the Augustan age, appear harsh and inelegant. The rhetoricians, abandoning wholly the noble simplicity and majesty of the ancients, taught youth the art of deceiving people, by using tragic pomp on every occasion. Most of the historians, too, thought less of order, perspicuity, and truth, than of empty and tawdry ornaments.

§ 2. Nearly all who attempted philosophy in this century were of the sect called Junior Platonists. It is not strange, therefore, that Platonic notions constantly occur in the works of Christians, as they do in those of others. Yet there were fewer of these philosophers in the West than in the East. In Syria, *Jamblichus* of Chalcis expounded Plato, or rather made that philosopher's opinions bend to his own estimate of them.² His writings show that he was supersti-

¹ [Decius, or Decimus Magnus, Ausonius, was a Latin poet, well born and educated at Bourdeaux, who flourished in the last half of this century. He was probably a nominal Christian, and much caressed and advanced to high honours by those in authority. His poems were chiefly short pieces, eulogies, epigrams, &c., and not devoid of merit. Yet the style attests the declining age of Roman literature. Edited by Tollius, Lugd. B. 1671, 4to; and Lat. and Fr. by Jaubert, Paris, 1769, 4 vols. 12mo. *Tr.*]

² [Jamblichus. There were *three* of this name; the *first* lived early in the second century; his works are now lost; the *second*

probably died about 333, and wrote largely; the *third* was contemporary with Julian, and wrote the life of Alypius the musician. The *second* is the one intended by Mosheim. He was a pagan, an enthusiast, and a great pretender to superior talents and learning. Of his works there remain, a *Life of Pythagoras*, published Gr. and Lat. with notes by Kuster, Amstelod. 1707, 4to; *Exhortation to the study of Philosophy*; three books on mathematical learning; *Commentary on Nicomachus*; *Institutes of Arithmetic*; and a *Treatise on the mysteries of the Egyptians and Chaldeans of Assyria*, published Gr. and Lat. with notes, by Tho. Gale, Oxon.

tious, cloudy, credulous, and without sound sense. He was succeeded by *Ædesius*,¹ *Maximus*,² and others; of whose absurdities *Eunapius* gives us an account. In Egypt, *Hypatia*,³ a distinguished lady, *Isidorus*,⁴ *Olympiodorus*,⁵ *Synesius*, a semi-Christian,⁶ and others of less fame, propagated this kind of wisdom: why not call it folly?

§ 3. The emperor *Julian* being wonderfully fond of this philosophy, as his writings prove, a great many were led into vying with each other to dress it out with every art within their power.⁷ But when *Julian* died, a dreadful storm burst upon the Platonists, during the reign of *Valentinian*; and several of them were arraigned and tried for their lives on the charge of practising magic and other crimes. In these commotions, *Maximus*, the preceptor of *Julian*, among others, suffered death.⁸ But it was rather the intimacy of these men with *Julian*, whose counsellors they had been, than the philosophy to which they were addicted, that proved their ruin. Hence the remainder of their body, having had no connexion with the court, underwent very little danger or loss in this persecution of the philosophers.

§ 4. The Christians, from the time of *Constantine* the Great, devoted much more attention to the study of philosophy and the liberal arts, than they had done before; and the emperors omitted no means which might awaken and cherish a thirst for learning. Schools were established in many of the towns; libraries were formed, and literary men were encouraged by stipends, by privileges, and by honours.⁹

1678, fol. See Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 260—270. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* iv. 282, &c., and Lardner's Works, vol. viii. Tr.]

¹ [Ædesius of Cappadocia, a disciple of Jamblichus, and, like his master, a devotee of theurgy. See Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 270, &c. Tr.]

² [Maximus of Ephesus, called the Cynic, another pretender to superhuman knowledge. He is said to have persuaded Julian to apostatise; and he certainly had great influence over that emperor. He was put to death, for practising magic, in the reign of Valens. See Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 281, &c. Eunapius (*de Vitis Sophistarum*) gives account of Jamblichus, Ædesius, and Maximus. Tr.]

³ [Hypatia of Alexandria, a lady who excelled all the philosophers of her age, and who publicly taught philosophy with great applause, flourished in the close of this century, and the first part of the next. She was murdered in a tumult, A.D. 415. See Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 15. Suidas, art. *Hypatia*, iii. 533. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, &c. xiv. 274. Menage, *Hist. Mulier. Philosoph.* § 49, &c. p. 494, &c.; and Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 351. Tr.]

⁴ [Isidorus Gazæus, from Gaza in Palestine, the place of his birth. See Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 341, &c. Schl.]

⁵ [Olympiodorus, author of a Commen-

tary upon Plato, still preserved in MS. at Paris; and a life of Plato, of which a Latin version has been published. There were several persons of this name. See Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 490. Tr.]

⁶ [Synesius, of Cyrene in Africa, studied under Hypatia; resided at Constantinople from A.D. 397—400, as deputy from his native city; was made bishop of Ptolemais A.D. 410. He wrote well for that age; though he was too much infected with the reigning philosophy. His works, as edited by Petavius, Gr. and Lat. Paris, 1612 and 1631, fol., are—*De Regno, ad Arcadium Imperatorem*; *Dio, vel de ipsius vite instituto*; *Calvitii encomium*; *Ægyptius, sive de Providentia*; *de Insomniis*; *Epistolæ* clv.; and several Discourses and Hymns. Tr.]

⁷ See Ez. Spanheim, *Prefatio ad Opp. Juliani*, et ad versionem Gallicam *Cesarum Juliani*, p. iii. et *Adnotat.* p. 234. Bletterie, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, liv. i. p. 26, &c.

⁸ Ammianus Marcellin. *Histor.* xxix. l. p. 556, ed. Valesii; and Bletterie, *Vie de Julien*, p. 30, &c. 155, 159, &c.; and *Vie de Jovien*, t. i. 194.

⁹ See Ja. Godefroi, *ad Codicis Theodos. titulos de Professoribus et Artibus liberalibus*; Fran. Balduin, *Constantinus Magnus*, p. 122, &c. Herm. Conringius, *Diss. de studiis Romæ et Constantinop.* subjoined to his *Antiquitatt. Academicæ*.

All this was required by the design which they had formed of gradually abolishing pagan idolatry; for the old heathen system derived its chief support from the learning of its advocates: and moreover, if Christian youths could not find instructors of their own belief, it must be feared that they would seek an education from pagan philosophers and rhetoricians, which might cause injury to religious truth.

§ 5. It must not be supposed, however, that the Christian church was full of literary, erudite, and philosophic men. For no law as yet kept an ignorant and uneducated person from sacred offices; and it appears, by unquestionable testimonies, that many, both bishops and presbyters, were entirely destitute of all science and learning. Besides, the party was both numerous and powerful, which considered all learning, but especially philosophical learning, as injurious nay, even destructive to true piety and religion. All the *ascetics*, *monks*, and *eremites*, were inclined towards this party; which was also highly favoured, not by women only, but by all besides who measured piety by gravity of countenance, sordidness of dress, and love of solitude, that is, by the many.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND OF ITS TEACHERS.

§ 1, 2. Form of the Christian church—§ 3. Conformed to the civil establishment—§ 4. Administration, internal and external, of the church—§ 5. Rank of the bishop of Rome—§ 6. Limits of his jurisdiction—§ 7. The bishop of Constantinople—§ 8. Vices of the clergy—§ 9. Distinguished writers in the Greek church—§ 10. Principal writers in the Latin church.

§ 1. CONSTANTINE the Great left the old form of the Christian community untouched; yet, in some respects, he improved and extended it. While, therefore, he suffered the church to continue, as heretofore, a sort of distinct republic within the political body, he nevertheless assumed a supreme power over this sacred community, with such liberty of modelling and controlling it as public good should need. Nor did any bishop call in question this power of the emperor. The people, therefore, in the same manner as before, freely chose their own bishops and teachers; and the bishops severally, in their respective districts or cities, directed and regulated all ecclesiastical affairs, using the presbyters as a council, and calling on the people for assent. The bishops also met together in conventions or councils, to deliberate on subjects in which the churches of a whole province were interested, on points of religious controversy, on the arrangement of divine worship, and other things. To these minor councils of one or more provinces there were now added assemblies or councils of the whole church. These, called *œumenical* or *general councils*,

met by authority from the emperor; who summoned the first of them at Nice. For he thought it just (and in this he was most likely guided by the judgment of the bishops), that causes of great moment, and affecting the church universally or the general principles of Christianity, should be examined and decided in conventions of the whole church. There were never, indeed, any councils held, which could strictly and properly be called *universal*; those, however, whose decrees and enactments were received and approved by the whole church, or by the greatest part of it, are commonly called *œcumenical*.

§ 2. Upon established rights, however, great encroachments were gradually made from the time when various disturbances and quarrels and horrid contests everywhere arose, either on account of religious affairs or doctrines, or of episcopal elections. For appeals from the weaker parties to the court gave the emperors an excellent opportunity of imposing various restrictions on the power of the bishops, the people's liberty, and the ancient customs. The bishops, too, themselves, whose wealth and influence were not a little augmented from the times of *Constantine*, gradually subverted and changed the ancient principles of church government. For they first excluded the people altogether from a voice in ecclesiastical affairs, and next gradually deprived even the *presbyters* of their former authority, in order that they might do everything at their discretion, and especially either draw the ecclesiastical property to themselves, or distribute it as they pleased. Hence, at the close of this century, only a slight shadow of the ancient church-government remained; that share of it, formerly vested in the presbyters and people, having passed chiefly to the bishops, the whole church's many shares to the emperors, or to their provincial governors and magistrates.

§ 3. *Constantine*, to render his throne secure and prevent civil wars, not only changed the system of Roman laws, but likewise, in many respects, the disposition of the commonwealth.¹ And as he wished, for various reasons, the church to have a constitution like that now given to the state, it became necessary that new grades of honour should be introduced among the bishops. The chiefs of their body were those who had heretofore stood foremost in the prelacy, namely, the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria; with whom the bishop of Constantinople was joined, after the imperial residence was transferred to that city. These four prelates answered to the four *prætorian præfects*, created by *Constantine*, and, perhaps even in this century, bore the Jewish title of *Patriarchs*. Next to these were the *exarchs*, corresponding with the civil *exarchs*, and presiding each over several provinces. The *metropolitans* came next, who governed only single provinces. After them ranked the *archbishops*, who had the inspection only of certain districts. The *bishops* brought up the rear; whose limits were not universally of the same extent, but in some provinces wider, in others narrower. To these I should add the *chorepiscopi*, or superintendents of country

¹ See Bos, *Hist. de la Monarchie Française*, i. 64. Giannone, *Hist. de Naples*, i. 94, 152.

churches, did I not know that the bishops, eager to increase their own power, had caused this order to be suppressed in most places.¹

¹ This is shown by Ludov. Thomasinus, *Disciplina Eccles. vet. et nova circa beneficia*, tom. i. various passages. [The fourth century was the most flourishing period of the Chorepiscopi: their position excited the jealousy of the bishops, and an attempt was made in a council of Laodicea, cir. 363, to suppress them. They appear, however, as delegates of other bishops in the council of Chalcedon in 451, and the title subsisted in the West until the ninth century. Robertson, i. 281. Gieseler, i. 417. *Ed.*] — [Though the ecclesiastical divisions of the Roman empire did not coincide exactly with the civil divisions, yet a knowledge of the latter will help us to form a better idea of the former. Accordingly, we annex the following account of the civil distribution copied from an ancient *Notitia Imperii*, said to have been written before the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, or before 395. See Pagi, *Critica in Baronii Annal. ad ann. 37*, t. i. p. 29, &c.]

I. *Praefectus Prætorio Orientis*: et sub eo Diöceses quinque, ss.

1. Diöcesis orientis, in qua Provinciæ xv. nempe, Palæstina, Phœnice, Syria, Cilicia, Cyprus, Arabia, Isauria, Palæstina Salutaris, Palæstina II. Phœnice Libani, Euphratensis, Syria Salutaris, Osrhoëna, Mesopotamia, et Cilicia II.

2. Diöcesis Ægypti, in qua Provinciæ vi. nempe, Libya superior, Libya inferior, Thebais, Ægyptus, Arcadia, et Augustamnica.

3. Diöcesis Asiæ, in qua Provinciæ x. nempe, Pamphylia, Hellespontus, Lydia, Pisidia, Lycæonia, Phrygia Pacatiana, Phrygia Salutaris, Lycia, Caria, et Insulæ (Cyclades).

4. Diöcesis Ponti, in qua Provinciæ x. nempe, Galatia, Bithynia, Honorias, Cappadocia I. Paphlagonia, Pontus Polemoniacus, Helenopontus, Armenia I. Armenia II. et Galatia Salutaris.

5. Diöcesis Thraciæ, in qua Provinciæ vi. nempe, Europa, Thracia, Hæmiomontis, Rhodope, Mœsia II. et Scythia.

II. *Praefectus Prætorio Illyrici*: et sub eo Diöceses duæ, ss.

1. Diöcesis Macedoniæ, in qua Provinciæ vi. nempe, Achaia, Macedonia, Creta, Thessalia, Epirus vetus, et Epirus nova.

2. Diöcesis Daciæ, in qua Provinciæ v. nempe, Dacia Mediterranea, Dacia Ripensis, Mœsia prima, Dardania Prævalitiana, et Pars Macedoniæ Salutaris.

III. *Praefectus Prætorio Italiæ*: et sub eo Diöceses tres, ss.

1. Diöcesis Italiæ, in qua Provinciæ xvii. nempe, Venetiæ, Æmilia, Liguria, Flaminia et Picenum Annonarium, Tuscia et Umbria, Picenum Suburbicarium, Campania, Sicilia,

Apulia et Calabria, Lucania et Brutii, Alpes Cottiae, Rhætia prima, Rhætia secunda, Samnium, Valeria, Sardinia, et Corsica.

2. Diöcesis Illyrici, in qua Provinciæ vi. nempe, Pannonia secunda, Savia, Dalmatia, Pannonia prima, Noricum Mediterraneum, et Noricum Ripense.

3. Diöcesis Africæ, in qua Provinciæ vii. nempe, Byzacium, Numidia, Mauritania Sitifensis, Mauritania Cæsariensis, Tripolis, et Africa Proconsularis.

IV. *Praefectus Prætorio Galliarum*: et sub eo Diöceses tres, ss.

1. Diöcesis Hispaniæ, in qua Provinciæ vii. nempe, Bætica, Lusitania, Gallæcia, Tarraconensis, Carthaginensis, Tingitania, et Baleares.

2. Diöcesis Galliarum, in qua Provinciæ xvii. nempe, Viennensis, Lugdunensis I. Germania I. Germania II. Belgica I. Belgica II. Alpes Maritimæ, Alpes Penninæ et Graiæ, Maxima Sequanorum, Aquitania I. Aquitania II. Novempopuli, Narbonensis I. Narbonensis II. Lugdunensis II. Lugdunensis III. et Lugdunensis Senonia.

3. Diöcesis Britanniarum, in qua Provinciæ v. nempe, Maxima Cæsariensis, Valentia, Britannia I. Britannia II. et Flavia Cæsariensis.

Thus the civil division of the Roman empire was, in this century, divided into 4 Prefectures, containing 13 Diöceses, which embraced 116 Provinces. The ecclesiastical division of the empire, though founded upon the civil division, was by no means so complete and so regular. [The presiding bishop of the province was the metropolitan, the presiding metropolitan of the diöcese was the exarch. *Ed.*] The civil provinces were generally ecclesiastical provinces, and under the inspection severally of the metropolitans, or archbishops of those provinces. Yet there were many bishops who were exempt from the inspection or jurisdiction of the metropolitans, and were therefore called *αὐτοκέφαλοι*, independent. They also bore the titles of archbishops and of metropolitans, although they had no suffragans, or bishops depending on them. Above the rank of metropolitans, there were properly none other than the patriarchs. For the exarchs of Asia, Cappadocia, and Pontus, were only the first metropolitans of those civil diöceses, while they belonged to no patriarchate. And the primates of certain countries, in after-ages, were only the metropolitans that ranked first, or had precedence, among the metropolitans of their respective countries. [The title of archbishop, which was first given to the bishop of Alexandria (Gieseler, i. 427), and afterwards to the other patriarchs, was

§ 4. The administration of ecclesiastical affairs was divided by *Constantine* himself into the *external* and the *internal*.¹ The latter

not at this period, nor even afterwards, universally equivalent to *metropolitan*. *Ed.*] Hence there were not properly *five* orders of bishops, above the rank of chorepiscopi, as Mosheim represents; but only three, namely, *patriarchs*, *metropolitans*, or *archbishops*, and simple *bishops*.—Before the times of *Constantine*, provincial councils were common; and these gave rise to the order of *metropolitans*. Among the metropolitans, those of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, stood pre-eminent in honour and influence. During the reign of *Constantine the Great*, the powers of these three *metropolitans* were enlarged; but whether they bore the title, or possessed the authority, of *patriarchs*, at that time, is not certain. They however became *patriarchs*, both in name and in power, before the century had elapsed. And these were the three original patriarchs. Towards the close of this century, the bishops of Constantinople obtained rank next to those of Rome, and extended their authority over several dioceses not subject to the other patriarchs. In the next century, the bishops of Jerusalem became independent of the patriarchs of Antioch; and thus there were *five* patriarchates formed. Their respective limits were as follows. The patriarchal authority of the bishops of Rome did not at first extend beyond Italy, perhaps not over the whole of that. For the bishops of Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain, and Illyricum, acknowledged no ecclesiastical head or ruler, except their own metropolitans. But after the dissolution of the western empire, the bishop of Rome found means to bring all the bishops and metropolitans of the West under his authority. This he justified, partly by claiming to be patriarch of all the West, and partly by virtue of his assumed supremacy over the whole church. The patriarchs of Constantinople claimed dominion over the civil dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, which belonged to the prefecture of the East, and also over the two dioceses composing the prefecture of Illyricum. No one of these dioceses had before belonged to any patriarchate; the three former having been governed by provincial councils, in which the metropolitans [or exarchs] of Ephesus, Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Heraclea in Thrace, had the precedence of all other metropolitans. The two other dioceses, those of Macedonia and Dacia, had been governed in a similar manner; and being afterwards claimed by the bishops of Rome, were the cause of long and violent contests between these ambitious prelates. But the patriarchs of Constantinople retained them, and thereby

extended their dominions northward over the Russian empire. The patriarchate of Antioch embraced, originally, the whole diocese of the East, and likewise extended over the churches beyond the limits of the Roman empire in Asia, quite to India. But in 451, the patriarchate of Jerusalem was created out of it, embracing the whole of Palæstina I. II. and III. or Salutaris, and thence to Mount Sinai and the borders of Egypt. The patriarchate of Alexandria embraced the civil diocese of Egypt; and thence extended into Abyssinia.—Such were the territorial limits of the five patriarchates, from the fifth century onward to the Reformation. In the eleventh century, *Nilus Doxopatrius*, of Constantinople, gives them substantially the same boundaries. From him we learn, that the patriarch of Constantinople then presided over fifty-two metropolitans, who had under them 649 suffragan bishops; and over thirteen titular metropolitans, i. e. bishops who were called metropolitans and *ἀντοκέφαλοι*, but had no suffragans; and likewise thirty-four titular archbishops. The patriarch of Antioch presided over thirteen metropolitans, with 139 suffragans, besides eight titular metropolitans, and thirteen titular archbishops. The patriarch of Jerusalem presided over four metropolitans with suffragans, and twenty-five titular archbishops. And the patriarch of Alexandria presided over seven metropolitans with suffragans, and five titular metropolitans and archbishops. The number of suffragans in the two last patriarchates is not given. *Tr.*—‘The first time we meet with the name *Patriarch*, given to any bishop by any public authority of the church, is in the council of Chalcedon, which mentions the most holy patriarchs of every diocese, and particularly *Leo*, patriarch of Great Rome. *Richerius*, who has written accurately about the councils, can trace the name no higher. Among private authors, the first that mentions patriarchs by name is *Socrates*, who wrote his history about the year 440, eleven years before the council of Chalcedon.’ *Bingham’s Antiquities*, i. 67. See that admirable work for information upon this matter; also *Cave’s Dissertation concerning the government of the Ancient Church*, Lond. 1683. *Edw. Brerewood, Veteris Ecclesiæ Gubernatio Patriarchalis*. *S.*—According to *Theodore Balsamon* (*Neale, Holy Eastern Church*, i. 126), the title of patriarch belongs correctly only to Antioch: the bishops of Rome and Alexandria being properly popes, and those of Jerusalem and Constantinople archbishops. *Ed.*]

¹ *Eusebius, de Vita Const. M.* iv. 24.

he relinquished to the bishops and to councils. It embraced all the essentials of religion, religious controversies, forms of worship, functions of the priests, their vices, and some other things. The *external* administration he took upon himself. It included whatever relates to the external condition of the church, or to its discipline, and also all contests and causes of the ministers of the church, both of the higher and of the lower orders, which did not respect religion and sacred functions, but property, worldly honours, and privileges, offences against the laws, and the like.¹ He therefore, and his successors, assembled councils, presided in them, assigned judges for religious disputes, decided contests between bishops and their people, determined the limit of ecclesiastical provinces, and by the ordinary judges, heard and decided upon the civil causes and common offences among the ministers of the church; ecclesiastical causes, on the other hand, he left to the cognisance of councils and bishops. Yet this famous partition of the ecclesiastical government into the *external* and the *internal* administrations was never clearly explained and accurately defined. Hence, both in this and in the following centuries, we see many transactions which do not accord with it, but contravene it. For the emperors not unfrequently determined religious matters of the interior kind: and, in like manner, councils and bishops often enacted laws respecting things which seem to belong to the external form and affairs of the church.

§ 5. The bishop of Rome took precedence over all others of the episcopal order. Nor was this pre-eminence founded solely on popular feeling and a prejudice of long standing, sprung from various causes: but also on those grounds which commonly give priority and greatness in the estimation of mortals. For he exceeded all other bishops in the amplitude and splendour of the church over which he presided, in the magnitude of his revenues and possessions, in the number of his ministers of various descriptions, in the weight of his influence with the people at large, and in the sumptuousness and magnificence of his style of living.² These marks of power and worldly greatness were so fascinating to the minds of Christians even in this age, that often most obstinate and bloody contests took place at Rome when a new pontiff was to be created by the suffrages of the priests and people. A shocking example of this is afforded by the

¹ See the imperial laws, in both the Justinian and Theodosian Codex; and, among others, Ja. Godefroi, *ad Codicem Theodos.* vi. 55, 58, 333, &c. [This whole system resulted, in part, from the office of Pontifex Maximus, which was retained by Constantine and all his successors, till into the fifth century; and, in part, from the conception of Constantine, that the church was a society existing independently of the state. See Boss, *Diss. de Pontificatu maximo Imperator. Christianor. Schl.*]

² Ammianus Marcellinus, *Hist.* xxvii. 3. [¹ Besides their standing rents and revenues,

their gains by collections and oblations were so great, that by them alone, in the time of pope Damasus, they were enabled to live in a state and grandeur like that of temporal princes, if we may believe the account given by Ammianus Marcellinus: and the story is known of Prætextatus a zealous Gentile, designed to be consul, who, reflecting upon the plenty of that see, was wont pleasantly to tell pope Damasus, *Make me but bishop of Rome, and I will immediately become a Christian.*' Cave's *Disc. of the Anc. Ch. Gov.* p. 25. S.]

disturbance at Rome in the year 366, after the death of *Liberius*. When they came to the choice of a new bishop, one party was for placing *Damasus*, and another for appointing *Ursicinus*, a deacon, over the widowed church; and the contention caused a cruel war, great loss of life, conflagrations, and battles. *Damasus* came off victorious in the contest; but whether his claims were better, or his cause more righteous, than those of *Ursicinus*, does not appear.¹ I dare not pronounce either of them a good man.

§ 6. It is, however, abundantly attested, that the bishops of Rome did not in this age possess supreme power and jurisdiction in the church. They were citizens in the commonwealth; and though higher in honour, they obeyed the laws and mandates of the emperors, just like other citizens. The more weighty religious causes were determined either by judges appointed by the emperor, or in councils; minor causes were decided by individual bishops. The laws relating to religion were enacted either by the emperors or by councils. No one of the bishops acknowledged that his authority was derived from the plenary power of the Roman bishop, or that he was constituted a bishop *by the favour of the apostolic see*. On the contrary, they all maintained that they were the ambassadors and ministers of *Jesus Christ*, and that their authority was derived from above.² Yet it is undeniable, that even in this age, several of those steps were laid, by which the Roman pontiffs afterwards mounted to the summit of ecclesiastical dominion; and this, partly by the imprudence of the emperors, partly by the sagacity of the pontiffs themselves, and partly by the hasty decision of certain bishops. Among these steps, however, I would assign either no place, or only the very last, to the *fourth canon* of the council of *Sardica*, in the year 347, to which the friends of the Roman pontiff assign the *first* and the most important place. For, not to mention that the authority and regularity of this council are very dubious, and that, not without reason, the enactments of the council are regarded by some as coming to us corrupted, and by others as

¹ See the writers of Lives of the Popes, among whom Arch. Bower has stated this matter ingenuously and impartially, in his *Hist. of the Popes*, i. 180, &c., ed. 2, Lond. 1749. [Ammian. Marcellin. *Hist.* xxvii. 3, says, that 137 corpses of the slain were found in one day in the church of Sici-ninus. *Tr.*]

² All these points are discussed at large by many writers, among whom I will name Peter de Marca, *de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*; L. E. du Pin, *de Antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina*; and especially, Dav. Blondel, *de la Primauté dans l'Eglise*, — a very learned work: [also Fred. Spanheim, *Diss. de Primatu Papæ, et Canone vi. Nicæno*. *Schl.* — The sixth canon of the council of Nice, A.D. 325, gave to the bishops of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch, severally, the same preeminence over their respective surrounding

bishops. Meletius had encroached upon the prerogatives of his metropolitan of Alexandria; and therefore the council ordain (according to the translation of Dionysius Exiguus), *ANTIQUA CONSUETUDO SERVETUR per Ægyptum, Libyam, et Pentapolim, ita ut Alexandrinus Episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatem; quia et Romæ Episcopo paribus mos est. Similiter autem et apud Antiochiam, cæterasque provincias, suis privilegia serventur ecclesiis*. To reconcile this canon with the papal claims of universal empire, the Romanists tell us, it relates merely to the patriarchal or metropolitan power of the bishop of Rome, and not to his power as *pope*: — a distinction which does not appear to have occurred to the Nicene fathers. See Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles.* cent. iv. diss. xx. *Tr.* — See also Cave, *Disc. of the Anc. Ch. Gov.* p. 50. *S.*]

forced,¹ it cannot be made to appear from that canon, that the bishops assembled at Sardica decided, that in all cases an appeal might be made to the Roman pontiff as the supreme and final judge. But suppose they had so decided, which yet can never be proved, how weak must that right be which is founded only on the decision of a single obscure council!²

§ 7. *Constantine* the Great, by transferring the imperial residence to Byzantium, and there founding the new city of Constantinople, undesignedly raised up against the rising power of the Roman pontiff a powerful competitor in the bishop of the new metropolis. For as the emperor wished his *Constantinople* to be another or a *new Rome*, and had endowed it with all the privileges, decorations, and honours of old Rome, the bishop of so great a city, the imperial residence besides, also wished to be thought every way equal in rank to the bishop of old Rome, and to have precedence of all other bishops. Nor did the emperors disapprove of this ambition, because they considered their own dignity as involved in that of the bishop of their metropolis. Therefore in the council of Constantinople, assembled in the year 381, by authority of the emperor *Theodosius* the Great, the bishop of Alexandria not being present, and the bishop of Rome being opposed to it, the bishop of Constantinople was, by the third canon, placed in the first rank after the bishop of Rome; the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, of course, to take rank after him. The bishop who had this honour conferred on him was *Nectarius*. His successor, *John Chrysostom*, went further, and subjected all Thrace, Asia,³ and Pontus, to his jurisdiction.⁴ The subsequent bishops of Constantinople gradually advanced their claims still further. But

¹ See Mich. Geddes, *Diss. de Canonibus Sardicensibus*; among his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. ii. p. 415; [and Bower, *Lives of the Popes*,—Pope Julius, i. 420, &c. ed. 2, Lond. 1749, 4to. Tr.]

² [This council was got up by Julius, bishop of Rome; and was designed to be a general council, and therefore held at Sardica in Illyricum, as accommodating both the East and the West; but as most of the eastern bishops withdrew from it, it was rather a council of the West. Its decrees were not confirmed by several subsequent councils, nor received by the whole church. See De Marca, *de Concordia Sacerdotii*, &c. vii. 4, 5, 11, 12, 15. By the third canon in the Greek, or the fourth in the Latin translation by Isidorus, it was ordered, that if any bishop shall think himself unjustly condemned, and wish for a new trial, his judges shall acquaint the bishop of Rome therewith, who may either confirm the first judgment, or order a new trial before such of the neighbouring bishops as he may choose to name. The fourth canon, according to the Greek, adds, that the see of the deposed bishop shall remain vacant, till the determination of the bishop of Rome is

known. By the fifth canon, according to the Greek, and the seventh of Isidorus, it is ordered, that if a condemned bishop apply to Rome for relief, the bishop of Rome may, if he see fit, not only order a new trial, but if the aggrieved bishop desire it, he may send one of his presbyters to sit and have a voice in the second trial. See De Marca, *loc. cit.* cap. 3. — Thus these canons do not give the bishop of Rome even an *appellate jurisdiction*, but only the power to decide whether an injured bishop shall have a new trial. Tr.]

³ [The diocese of the western part of Asia Minor. Tr.]

⁴ See Peter de Marca, *Diss. de Constantinop. Patriarchatus Institutione*; annexed to his work, *de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, iv. 163, &c., ed. Bamb. 1789. Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 15, &c. Sam. Parker, *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first six hundred years*, p. 245, Lond. 1683, 8vo. [The canon of the council was thus expressed: ‘Constantinopolitanæ civitatis Episcopum habere oportet primatûs honorem post Romanum Episcopum, propter eâ quod sit nova Roma.’ Tr.]

this revolution in the ecclesiastical government, and the sudden elevation of the Byzantine bishop to high rank, to the injury of others, in the first place fired the Alexandrine prelates with resentment against those of Constantinople; and in the next place, gave rise to those unhappy contests between the pontiffs of old and new Rome, which were protracted through several centuries, with various success, and finally produced a separation between the Latin and the Greek churches.

§ 8. The vices of the clergy, especially of those who officiated in large and opulent cities, were augmented in proportion to the increase of their wealth, honours, and advantages, derived from the emperors and from numberless other sources: and that this increase was very great, after the times of *Constantine*, is acknowledged by all. The *bishops* had shameful quarrels among themselves, respecting the extent of their jurisdiction and boundaries; and while they trampled on the rights of the people and of the inferior clergy, they vied with the civil governors of provinces in luxury, arrogance, and voluptuousness.¹ The *presbyters*, in many places, boldly challenged an equality with bishops, in rank and authority. Of the pride and effeminacy of the deacons we often meet with various complaints. Those especially who ranked first among the presbyters and deacons, were unwilling to be considered as belonging to the same order with the others; and, therefore, they not only assumed the titles of *archpresbyters* and *archdeacons*, but also they thought themselves authorised to take far greater liberties than were allowed to others.

§ 9. Among the more celebrated writers of this age, who shed lustre on the eastern provinces and Greece, the most eminent were those whose names here follow. *Eusebius Pamphili*,² bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, a man of great reading and erudition, who has acquired immortal fame by his labours in ecclesiastical history, and in other branches of theological learning. Yet he was not free from errors and defects; leaning towards the side of those who hold an inequality between the three persons in the Godhead. Some rank him among the *Arians*;³ but they certainly err in so doing, if they

¹ See Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, i. 23, ii. 32, 51. *Dialog.* i. 21. Add to this, the account given by Dav. Clarkson, in his *Discourse on Liturgies*, p. 228 (of the French edition), of the extremely corrupt state of morals among the clergy; and, in particular, of the eagerness of the bishops to extend the boundaries of their authority, p. 150, &c.

² [So called from his close intimacy with the martyr, Pamphilus, who has sometimes been inaccurately represented as his brother. Mosheim styles him Eusebius *Pamphili*, as does Cave, but Du Pin, Eusebius *Pamphilus*. He requires either one of these distinctions, or to be mentioned with his see of Cæsarea, to prevent confusion with Eusebius of Nico-

media, Eusebius of Emesa, and others of the same name. S.]

³ No one has, with more zeal and learning, accused Eusebius of Arianism, than Joh. le Clerc, in his *Epistolæ Ecclesiast.* annexed to his *Ars Critica*, ep. ii. p. 30, &c. To him, add Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. Nov. Test.* sæc. iv. diss. xvii. All, however, that these and others labour to prove is, that Eusebius thought that there was some disparity and a subordination among the persons of the Godhead. And suppose this to have been his opinion, it will not follow that he was an Arian, unless the term be taken in a very extensive and improper sense. It is to be lamented that so many abuse this term, and apply it to persons who, though

intend by an Arian, one who embraces the opinions taught by *Arius*, the presbyter of Alexandria. *Peter*, bishop of Alexandria, who is

in error, are very far from holding the opinions of Arius. [Eusebius Pamphili (ss. *amicus*, *philos*) was born about 270, probably at Cæsarea, where he spent nearly all his life. Till about forty years of age, he lived in great intimacy with the martyr Pamphilus, a learned and devout man of Cæsarea, and founder of an extensive library there, from which Eusebius derived his vast stores of learning. Pamphilus was two years in prison, during which Eusebius was constantly with him. After the martyrdom of his friend, in 309, Eusebius fled first to Tyre, and thence to Egypt, where he lived till the persecution subsided. After his return to Cæsarea, about 314, he was made bishop of his own city. In 325, he attended the council of Nice, was appointed to deliver the address to the emperor on his entering the council, and then to be seated at his right hand. The first draft of the Nicene creed was made by him; to which, however, the term *ὁμοούσιον* and the *anathemas* were added by the council, not without some scruples on the part of Eusebius. Afterwards Eusebius appeared to belong to a moderate party, who could not go all lengths with either side. About 330, he refused the patriarchal chair of Antioch; because the ancient customs forbade the translation of bishops. He died about 340. The opinion advanced by Mosheim, respecting the Arianism of Eusebius, is supported at length by Socrates among the ancients, *H. E.* ii. 21; and by W. Cave, in his *Diss. de Eusebii Cæsariens. Arianismo*, *adv. Joh. Clericum*; and in his *Epistola Apologet. ad eundem*; both are annexed to his *Historia Litterar. Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* — Of the numerous works of Eusebius, the following have been preserved.

1. *Chronicon*, originally in two parts; the *first*, a brief history of the origin and revolutions of all nations; and the *second*, a full chronological table of the same events. Little of the original Greek remains; but we have the Latin translation of the *second* part by Jerome; which, with what could be gleaned of the Greek, and considerable additions from other ancient chroniclers, was published by Jos. Scaliger, 1606, fol. and a 2nd ed. by Morus, 1658.

2. *Preparatio Evangelica*, in fifteen books; intended to *prepare* the minds of pagans to embrace Christianity, by showing, that the pagan religions are absurd, and far less worthy to be received than the Christian. It is a learned and valuable work, published Gr. and Lat. by F. Vigerus, Paris, 1628, fol.; Cologne (Leipsic), 1688. [Oxford, by Gaisford, 1843. *Ed.*]

3. *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in twenty books, of which the last ten are lost. This is an attempt to *demonstrate* the truth of the Christian religion, by arguments drawn from the Old Test., and was, therefore, intended especially for the Jews. It is far less valuable than the former. Ed. Paris, 1628, and Cologne, 1688, fol. [Oxford, by Gaisford, 1852. *Ed.*]

4. *Contra Hieroclem Liber*; in defence of Christianity, against the attack of that pagan philosopher. See the article *Hierocles*, supra, p. 229, note *. It is published Gr. and Lat. annexed to the *Demonstratio Evang.* and by Godf. Olearius, with the works of the two Philostrati, Lips. 1709, fol. [Oxford, by Gaisford, 1852. *Ed.*]

5. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in ten books, from the birth of Christ to the death of Licinius in 324: a most valuable treasure, though less full and complete than could be wished. Eusebius was an impartial historian, and had access to the best helps for composing a correct history which his age afforded. See Ch. Aug. Kestner, *Commentatio de Eusebii Historiæ Eccles. conditoris Auctoritate et Fide diplomatica, sive de ejus Fontibus et Ratione, qua eis usus est*; Gotting. 1816, 4to. This work, with the three following, was best edited, Gr. and Lat. by Valesius, Paris, 1659 and 1671; Amsterd. 1695; by W. Reading, Cambridge, 1720, 3 vols. fol. — including Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Evagrius, Theodorus Lector, and Philostorgius. The histories of Euseb. Socrat. Sozom. and Evag. with the three following works, were translated into English, Cambr. 1683, 1 vol. fol. [Oxford, edited by E. Burton, 1842. *Ed.*]

6. *Martyribus Palestinæ Liber*; usually appended to the eighth book of his *Hist. Eccles.* It gives account of the sufferers in the East and in Egypt, during the persecution of Diocletian, or A.D. 303—313. [Published from a Syriac MS. in a fuller form than the Greek, by W. Cureton, Lond. 1861. *Ed.*]

7. *De Vita Constantini Magni*, libri iv.; a panegyric, rather than a biography.

8. *Oratio de Laudibus Constantini*; delivered on the emperor's *Tricennalia*, A.D. 335.

9. *Contra Marcellum*, libri ii.; composed by order of the council of Constantinople, 336, by which Marcellus was condemned as a Sabellian: annexed, Gr. and Lat. to the Paris edition of the *Præp. Evang.* 1628.

10. *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, libri iii. This also is in confutation of Marcellus' opinions; and is printed with the former, Gr. and Lat. subjoined to the *Præp. Evang.*

11. *De Locis Hebraicis*; a kind of Biblical

highly extolled by *Eusebius*.¹ *Athanasius*, bishop of Alexandria, famous, among other writings and acts, for his very strenuous opposition to the Arians.² *Basil*, surnamed the *Great*, archbishop of

Gazetteer of Palestine; edited with the Latin translation of Jerome, by Bonfrerius, Paris, 1631.

12. *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*, ed. by Meursius, Leyden, 1617, 4to.

13. *Vitæ Prophetarum*, ascribed to Euseb. Gr. and Lat. Paris, 1580, fol. with the Comment of Procopius in Isaiam.

14. *Canones sacrorum Evangeliorum*; tables, showing what portions of the Gospel History are narrated by one, by two, by three, or by four Evangelists. The Latin translation of Jerome was published in the *Orthodoxographia*, in the Works of Jerome, and in *Biblioth. Patrum*.

15. *Apologiæ pro Origene Liber primus* (the other five books are wholly lost); the Latin translation of this, by Rufinus, is published among the works of Jerome.

16. *Commentarii in Psalmos CL.* (but all beyond Ps. 119 is lost), published Gr. and Lat. by Montfaucon, *Collect. Nov. Gr. Patrum*, tom. i. Paris, 1706, fol.

17. *Commentarii in Isaiam*; ed. Gr. and Lat. by Montfaucon, *ubi supra*, tom. ii.

18. *Fourteen Latin Essays, or Discourses against Sabellianism, &c.* were published by Sirmond, Paris, 1643, 8vo, under the dubious title of *Eusebii Cesariensis Opuscula* xiv.

19. *Eclogarum propheticarum de Christo libri iv.* (a collection and explanation of the Old Test. prophecies concerning Christ) [edited for the first time from MS. by Gaisford, Oxford, 1842. *Ed.*]

20. *Epistola ad Cesarienses*; a letter to his own church concerning the Nicene creed; extant, Gr. and Lat. in Socrates, *H. E.* i. 8. Theod. *H. E.* i. 12, et inter *Opera Athanasii*, i. 238, ed. Paris.

[21. *Theophania*, published by Dr. Lee, from the Syriac. *Ed.*]

Eusebius wrote many other works which have not reached us: namely, *de Præparatione Ecclesiastica Libri aliquot*; *de Demonstratione Ecclesiast.* — *contra Porphyrium*, libri xxv.; *de Evangeliorum Dissonantia*; *Comment. in i. Epist. ad Corinth.* — *περὶ τοπικῶν ὑποτάτων* Liber primus (the first part of No. 11); *de Vita Pamphili*, libri iii.; *Confutationis et Apologiæ libri ii.* (probably a defence of himself against the charge of Arianism); *Antiquorum Martyriorum Collectio* (said to be in eleven books); *Acta Martyrii Sti Luciani*; *Descriptio Basilicæ Hierosolym.* — *de Festo Paschali Liber*; *Epistola ad Constantiam de Imagine Christi*; *Epistola ad Alexandrum Ep. Alex.* *de Ario*; *Epistola ad Euphrationem* (extracts from these three Epistles are found in the *Acta Concilii Niceni II.* Actione 6ta). *Tr.*

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* ix. 6. [Peter suc-

ceeded Theonas in the see of Alexandria, in 300; was imprisoned in 303, and whether released or not, before his martyrdom, in 311, is uncertain. He is represented as a very learned, pious, and active bishop. Of his writings, nothing remains but some rules respecting penance, and other points of ecclesiastical discipline, to be found in the collections of the ancient canons and decrees of councils. *Tr.*]

² The accounts given of Athanasius by the oriental writers, are collected by Euseb. Renaudot, in his *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinorum*, p. 83. All the works of Athanasius were splendidly published in three volumes, folio, by the Benedictine monk, Bernh. de Montfaucon.—[Athanasius was born at Alexandria about the year [296.] He had a good education, and early displayed great strength of mind, and uncommon sagacity as a disputant, and a man of business. He was ordained a deacon in 319, and became the confidant and chief counsellor of his bishop Alexander, whom he accompanied to the council of Nice in 325. In that council he was very active, and acquired great reputation. In 326, Alexander died, and, at his recommendation, Athanasius succeeded to the see of Alexandria. For half a century he was the head of the orthodox party in the Arian controversy. This rendered him extremely odious to the Arians, and involved him in controversy and sufferings nearly all his life. False accusations were raised against him; and a council was held at Casarea, A. D. 334, before which he was summoned, but would not appear. The next year, by peremptory command of the emperor Constantine, he appeared before the council of Tyre, and answered to the charges of murder, unchastity, necromancy, encouraging sedition, oppressive exactions of money, and misuse of church property. Though his defence was good, he could not obtain justice; and he therefore fled to Constantinople, imploring the protection of the emperor. Here a council was assembled in 336, and a new charge falsely preferred against him, namely, that he prevented the shipments of corn from Alexandria to Constantinople. He was unjustly condemned, and banished to Treves in Gaul. Arius died that year, and Constantine the Great the year following. In 338, the sons of Constantine allowed Athanasius to return to Alexandria. He immediately began to displace Arians, and to recall the churches to the faith. Disturbances ensued; Athanasius was again accused, and made application to the bishop of Rome for aid. In 341, the council of

Cæsarea,¹ who was inferior to few of his time, in felicity of genius, skill in debate, and eloquence.² *Cyril*, bishop of Jerusalem, has left

Antioch decreed that no bishop, who had been deposed by a council, ought ever to return to his see; and on this ground, the see of Alexandria was declared vacant, and one Gregory of Cappadocia appointed to it. Gregory took forcible possession of it, and Athanasius fled to Rome for protection. A provincial council held there acquitted him on all the charges of his adversaries [342]; and five years after [A. D. 347], a much larger council, held at Sardica, did the same. In [349], after an exile of seven or eight years, Athanasius was permitted, by the Arian emperor Constantius, to return to his see. But on the death of Constans, he was again accused and persecuted. Constantius caused him to be condemned in a council at Arles in [353], and at the council of Milan in 355. Athanasius concealed himself at Alexandria two years, and then retired among the hermits of Egypt till the death of Constantius in 361. In this retirement he wrote most of his best works. After the accession of Julian, in 362, he returned to his flock. But [soon] after, the pagans joining the Arians, induced Julian to banish him again. But Julian died [in 363], and Athanasius returned immediately to his see. In 367, the Arian emperor Valens attempted to remove him, but without success. He died A. D. 373, aged about seventy-five, having been a bishop forty-six years. He was truly a great man, a good bishop, and a most able, persevering, and successful defender of the orthodox faith, in respect to the Trinity. [Cf. Neale's *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, i. 152—200. Stanley's *Eastern Church*, Lect. vii. *Ed.*] His works are chiefly controversial, and in relation to that one doctrine. They consist of numerous letters and tracts, together with some brief expositions of the Scriptures, and a life of St. Anthony. His four Orations, or Discourses, against the Arians, and his Discourse against the pagans, which are his largest works, were translated into English by Sam. Parker, and printed at Oxford, 1713, 2 vols. 8vo. His works, Gr. and Lat. two volumes, in three parts, were best published by Montfaucon, Paris, 1698; and Padua, 1777, fol. But a great number of letters, tracts, comments, and narratives, the production of subsequent ages, are falsely ascribed to him, and printed with his works. Among these, beyond all question, is the creed, *Quicunque vult*, called the *Athanasian Creed*. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 180. Oudin, *de Scriptor. Eccles.* i. 312. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* v. 297. Montfaucon, *Pref. ad Opp. Athanasii*; and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xii. 93—252. *Tr.*] [The Festal Epistles, Historical Tracts,

and Books against the Arians are translated in the *Library of the Fathers*, vols. 8, 13, 19, 38, Oxford, v. y. *Ed.*]

¹ [In Cappadocia. *Tr.*]

² His works are published by the Benedictine monk, Julian Garnier, Paris [1721—1730], 3 vols. fol. [Basil was born at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, about A. D. 329. His first instruction in religion was from his grandmother Macrina, a hearer and admirer of Gregory Thaumaturgus. His father, whose name was Basil, instructed him in the liberal arts. Thence he went to Constantinople or to Cæsarea in Palestine, and studied under Libanius the sophist. Next he studied at Athens, under Himerius and Proæresius, having Gregory Naz. and Julian the apostate for fellow-students, in language, eloquence, poetry, history, and philosophy. In 355, he returned to Cappadocia, taught rhetoric a short time, and then retired for thirteen years to a monastery in Pontus. From this time he became a most rigid ascetic, and a very zealous monk. He founded several monasteries, and composed rules and regulations for monks. In 363 he was called to Cæsarea, and ordained a presbyter; the next year, falling out with his bishop Eusebius, he retired to his monastery, but was soon recalled by the bishop. He was now a very popular and efficient preacher. On the death of Archbishop Eusebius, in 370, Basil was raised to the archiepiscopal chair. He still dressed and lived like a monk, but was a most active and efficient bishop. He reformed the morals of the clergy, established rigid discipline in the churches, promoted orthodoxy and harmony in that jarring age, established almshouses for the sick and indigent, and died triumphantly, on the 1st of January, 379. Eulogies of him were composed by Gregory Naz., Gregory Nyssen (who was his brother), Ephraem Syrus, and Amphilochius. He was a fine scholar, an elegant writer, and a good reasoner. His works that remain are numerous, consisting of near a hundred orations, sermons, and homilies, three hundred and sixty-five epistles, various ascetic tracts, controversial pieces, a liturgy, &c. One of his best pieces is his treatise on the person and offices of the Holy Spirit. He is unequal in his performances, and comes much short of Chrysostom as an orator. Yet his enthusiasm, his flexibility of style, and his clear and cogent reasoning, notwithstanding the gloomy austerity of his monastic character, entitle him to that high rank among the ancient clergy, which has ever been assigned him. See Godf. Hermant, *Vie de S. Basile le Grand, Archevêque*

us some catechetical discourses which he delivered at Jerusalem; but many suspect him of intimacy with the semi-Arians.¹ *John*, for his eloquence surnamed *Chrysostom*, a man of genius, who presided over the church of Antioch and that of Constantinople, and has left us various specimens of his erudition, among which his public discourses, that were received with vast applause, stand conspicuous.² *Epipha-*

de Césarée en Cappadoce, et celle de S. Grégoire de Nazianze, Archev. de Constantinople, Paris, 1679, 2 vols. 4to. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* viii. 60, &c. Jul. Garnier, *Vita Sti Basilii*, prefixed to the third vol. of his *Opp. Basilii*, Paris, 1730: and Schroeckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xiii. 1—214. Milner's *Church History*, cent. iv. ch. 23. For his character as a preacher, see Bernh. Eschenberg, *Gesch. der Religionsvortrag*, p. 150—162, Jena, 1785, 8vo; and J. W. Schmidt, *Anleitung zum populären Kanzelvortrag*, pt. iii. p. 87—90, ed. 2, Jena, 1800, 8vo. *Tr.*]

¹ The later editions of his works are, in England, by Tho. Milles [Oxford, 1703, fol.], and in France, by the Benedictine August. Touttee, [Paris, 1720, fol.—Cyril is supposed to have been born at Jerusalem, about 315. He was made deacon in the church of Jerusalem about 335, and presbyter perhaps three years after. On the death of Maximus the bishop, Cyril was raised to the episcopal chair. But the Arian controversy, and his contest with Acacius of Caesarea respecting the priority of their episcopal sees, caused him to be twice deposed (A. D. 357 or 358, and 360), and to be expelled from his see by the emperor Valens in 367. But he returned after short intervals to his charge; and from 378, sat peaceably till his death, A. D. 386. He appears to have been truly orthodox, though not disposed to go to extremes. (Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 26, and v. 9.) Of his works, we have twenty-three Lectures to Catechumens; the first eighteen on the creed of his church (which was very nearly the same with what we call the Apostles' Creed), and the other five, to the newly baptized, on the ordinances, baptism, chrism (or confirmation), and the Lord's supper. These lectures, though written when Cyril was a young man, and only a presbyter, about 348 or 349, are an invaluable treasure to us; as they are the most complete system of theology, and most circumstantial account of the rites of the church, which have reached us from so early an age. They are plain, didactic treatises, well adapted to the object for which they were written. See Tzschirner, *de Claris Vet. Eccl. Oratoribus*, Commentatio vii. Lips. 1821, 4to. Besides these lectures, a letter of his to the emperor Constantius, giving account of a marvellous appearance of a luminous cross in the heavens, A. D. 351; and a discourse he delivered at Tyre, are pre-

served. See Cave, *Historia Litteraria*; Touttee, preface to Cyril's Works; and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xii. 343—444. *Tr.*—The Lectures are translated in the *Library of the Fathers*, vol. 2. *Ed.*]

² For the best edition of the entire works of this most elegant and gifted man, in eleven [thirteen] large folio volumes, we are indebted to the industry of Bernh. de Montfaucon, Paris, 1718—38. [John Chrysostom was the son of a respectable military gentleman of Antioch in Syria, named Secundus. He was born in 354, and lost his father in his childhood. Early discovering marks of uncommon genius, his mother Anthusa, a pious and excellent woman, procured for him the best instructors in all branches of learning. After spending three years in the family, and under the religious instruction of Meletius the bishop of Antioch, he attended the schools of Libanius, in rhetoric, of Andragathias, in philosophy, and of Carterius and Diodorus (afterwards bishop of Tarsus), in sacred literature, who taught him to construe the Scriptures literally. Distinguished as a scholar, he was also early pious; and about the age of twenty, embracing a monastic life, he retired to the mountains, and spent four years in the society of an aged hermit, and two years more in a solitary cave. Nearly worn out by his austerities, he was obliged to return to Antioch, where he was made a deacon in 381, and began to write at the age of twenty-six. Five years after he was ordained a presbyter, and began to preach. During twelve years he wrote and delivered an immense number of sermons, orations, and homilies. In 398, he was made patriarch of Constantinople, and in that station laboured and preached incessantly. But his life was too austere, his preaching too pungent, and his discipline too strict, for that corrupt metropolis. The empress, the lax clergy, and many courtiers, combined against him. In 403 he was summoned before an irregular council, to answer to forty-six frivolous or false charges; and refusing to appear, he was condemned, deposed, and banished for contumacy. But his people were so tumultuous, that his enemies were compelled to recall him. The next year, however, A. D. 404, he was forcibly removed to Cucusus in Armenia, to the unspeakable grief of all good men. Here he suffered extremely, his health failed, and

nus, bishop of Salamina in Cyprus, has described the various sects of Christians, as far down as his own times, in a large volume; which, however, contains many defects and misrepresentations, arising from the credulity and ignorance of the author.¹ Gregory of Nazianzus,

being removed to Pityus in Colchis, he died on the road thither, the 14th of September, 407, aged fifty-two years and eight months. For overpowering popular eloquence, Chrysostom had no equal among the fathers. His discourses show an inexhaustible richness of thought and illustration, of vivid conception, and striking imagery. His style is elevated, yet natural and clear. He transfigures his own glowing thoughts and emotions into all his hearers, seemingly without effort, and without the power of resistance. Yet he is sometimes too florid, he uses some false ornaments, he accumulates metaphors and illustrations, and carries both his views and his figures too far. The spirit of the man, and some idea of his style, may be learned from the following literal translation of a paragraph in one of his private letters to a friend, written during his exile:—“When driven from the city, I cared nothing for it. But I said to myself, if the empress wishes to banish me, let her banish me:—The earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof. If she would saw me in sunder, let her saw me in sunder:—I have Isaiah for a pattern. If she should plunge me in the sea:—I remember Jonah. If she would thrust me into the fiery furnace:—I see the three children enduring that. If she would cast me to wild beasts:—I call to mind Daniel in the den of lions. If she would stone me, let her stone me:—I have before me Stephen the proto-martyr. If she would take my head from me, let her take it:—I have John the Baptist. If she would deprive me of my worldly goods, let her do it:—naked came I from my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return. An apostle has told me, “God respecteth not man’s person:” and, “if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.” And David clothes me with armour, saying, “I will speak of thy testimonies before kings, and will not be ashamed.” The works of Chrysostom (including some falsely ascribed to him) consist of about 350 sermons and orations, on a great variety of subjects and occasions; about 620 homilies, or exegetical discourses, on different books of the Old and New Testaments; and about 250 Letters; together with several tracts on monasticism, and a treatise on the Priesthood, in six books. There is also a *Liturgy* which bears his name, being that used at Constantinople, and which perhaps received some alterations from his hand. For an account of his life and writings, see Cave, *Histor. Litteraria*; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xi. 1—405, 547—626.

Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* x. 245—490. Montfaucon, *Opp. Chrysost.* xiii. 1—177. For the sentiments, character, and influence of the man, see A. Neander’s *Johannes Chrysostomus und die Kirche in dessen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1821-22. 2 vols. 8vo. Tr.]

¹ His works, with a Latin translation and notes, were published by the Jesuit, Dionys. Petavius [Paris, 1622, 2 vols. fol. and Cologne (Lips.), 1682]. His life is given in a good-sized volume, by Ja. Gervasius, Paris, 1738, 4to. [Epiphanius, of Jewish descent, was born at Bezanduca, a village near Eleutheropolis, about twenty miles from Jerusalem, about 310. He became a monk in early life, visited Egypt, fell into the toils of the Gnostics, escaped, was intimate with St. Antony; and returning to Palestine in his twentieth year, about 330, became a disciple of Hilarion, established a monastery near his native village, called Ancient Ad, where he lived more than thirty years. He read much, and was ordained a presbyter over his monastery. In 367 he was made archbishop of Constantia (formerly Salamis) in Cyprus, but still lived by monastic rules.—He engaged in all the controversies of the times, was an active and popular bishop for thirty-six years, and regarded as a great saint and worker of miracles. In 376 he was at Antioch, on the Apollinarian heresy; and 382, at Rome, on the Meletian controversy. He had a long and fierce contest with John, bishop of Jerusalem, respecting Origenism, which he regarded with strong abhorrence. His friend Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, having expelled some monks from Egypt, on the charge of Origenism, in 401, Epiphanius held a provincial council of Cyprus, against that error; and as the expelled monks fled to Constantinople, Epiphanius followed them in 402, intending to coerce Chrysostom into a condemnation of those monks and of Origenism. But his enterprise wholly failed, and he died on his way home, A.D. 403, aged above ninety years. He became an author after the age of sixty. His first work, *Anchoratus*, was written A.D. 374, to teach the world genuine Christianity, in opposition to the prevailing, and especially the Arian, heresies. Soon after he composed his great work *contra octoginta Hæreses*, in three books, divided into seven parts or *tomæ*. He also made an Epitome of this work; and wrote a treatise on (Scripture) Weights and Measures; a Letter to John, bishop of Jerusalem; another to Jerome, and some other works of little value. It is said, he

and *Gregory* of Nyssa, obtained much renown among the theologians and disputants of this age; nor, as their works show, were they altogether unworthy of commendation.¹ But posterity would have given

understood five languages, Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek; and Latin. His learning was great, his judgment rash, and his credulity and mistakes very abundant.—See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 231—234; and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* x. 1—100. *Tr.*]

¹ Tolerable editions of the writings of both these men were published in France during the seventeenth century; but better editions are anticipated from the Benedictines. [After long delay, the first vol. of the expected Benedictine edition of *Gregory Nazianzen's* works appeared at Paris, 1778, by Clemencet, large fol. [vol. ii. 1840]. Of the old editions, the best is that of Billius, Gr. and Lat. Paris, 1609, 1630, and Cologne (Lips.), 1690, 2 vols. fol. His works, as here published, consist of about 50 Orations or Sermons; near 250 Epistles; and about 140 Poems. Besides these, Muratori has published 228 Epigrams and short poems of his, in his *Anecd. Gr.* p. 1—116, Patav. 1709, 4to. Some of the orations are violent attacks upon Arians and others; many others are eulogies on his friends and on monks; and a few are discourses on practical subjects. Of the poems, one of the longest is an account of his own life. Most of them were written after he retired from public life, and are of a religious character, but of no great merit as specimens of genius. As an orator, *Gregory Naz.* is considered superior to *Basil* for strength and grandeur. He also possessed a fertile imagination. But he has little method, and he abounds in false ornament.—He was born about 325. His father, who was also named *Gregory*, was bishop of *Nazianzus* in *Cappadocia* for about forty-five years, from A. D. 329 to 374. His mother *Nonna*, like the mother of *Samuel*, devoted her son to the Lord before he was born. His education was begun at *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, continued at *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*, and at *Alexandria*, and completed at *Athens*, at the age of thirty, A. D. 355. He was at *Athens* about five years, and there commenced that intimacy with *Basil the Great* which lasted through life. On his return to *Nazianzus* in 356, he was baptized, and betook himself to a retired and studious life, for which he always manifested a strong predilection. In 361, his father compelled him to receive ordination as a presbyter; and the next year he preached his first sermon. On the death of *Julian*, who had been his fellow-student at *Athens*, he composed two invectives against him. His friend, archbishop *Basil*, in 372, offered him the bishopric of *Sasima*, which he refused with indignation, on account of his aversion to public life. Yet he afterwards consented to be ordained

as assistant to his aged father, on condition of not being obliged to succeed him. Soon after the death of his father, in 374, he retired to *Seleucia*, and spent three years in obscurity. In 379, being pressed beyond the power of resistance, he went to *Constantinople* to preach to the remnant of the orthodox there. His success in converting Arians was here very great: and he was so popular, that the general council of *Constantinople*, and the emperor *Theodosius*, constrained him to accept the patriarchal chair. But before the council rose, it being objected to him, that it was irregular for a bishop to be transferred from one see to another, he gladly resigned. Returning to *Nazianzus*, he discharged the episcopal functions there for a short time. But in 383, he retired altogether from public life, and after about seven years, spent chiefly in writing religious poetry, he closed life, about A. D. 389. See Cave, *Hist. Litterar.*; and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xiii. 268—458. *Gregory*, bishop of *Nyssa* in *Cappadocia*, and younger brother of *Basil the Great*, was probably born about 331, at *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*. Of his early education little is known. He was no monk, and at first averse from the ministry. He was made bishop of *Nyssa* in *Cappadocia* about 372. But soon after he was driven from his see, by the persecution of the Arians, and for several years travelled from place to place. In 378 he returned to his see. Afterwards he was much employed on councils, and was greatly esteemed by the orthodox. The council of *Antioch*, 379, appointed him to visit the churches in *Arabia*, and restore order there. On his way he visited *Jerusalem*, and was disgusted with the profligate morals there. In 381 he wrote his great work against *Eunomius* the Arian, in thirteen books, which procured him great reputation. At the general council of *Antioch*, in the same year, he is reported to have made the new draft of the *Nicene Creed*, which was afterwards universally adopted by the orthodox. He was also at the council of *Constantinople* in 394, and probably died not long after. He was a man of considerable acumen, a zealous polemic, and an extravagant orator. His works consist of polemic discourses and treatises, orations, eulogies, letters, and homilies; and were published, Gr. and Lat., by *Fronto le Duc*, Paris, 1615, 2 vols. fol., to which *Gretser* added a third vol. Paris, 1618. The three vols. were reprinted, but less correctly, Paris, 1638, fol. A better edition has long been desired. See Cave, *Histor. Litterar.*, and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xiv. 3—147. *Tr.*]

them higher praise if they had been less fond of Origen, and more free from the false eloquence of the sophists. Among the Syrians, *Ephraem* has gained immortality for his name by the sanctity of his life, and by a great number of writings, in which he confutes heretics, explains the Scriptures, and treats on religious duties.¹ Among those of whom but few works have reached us, are *Pamphilus*, the martyr and intimate friend of Eusebius;² *Diodorus* of Tarsus;³ *Hosius* of Corduba;⁴ *Eustathius* of Antioch;⁵ *Didymus*

¹ A full account is given of him by Jos. Simon Asseman, in his *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, i. 24, &c. The English published several of his works, in Greek, at Oxford, [by Edw. Thwaites, 1709, fol.] The same were published in a Latin translation by Gerh. Vossius, [Rome, 1589—97, three vols. fol.] His works were published in Syriac, a few years since, at Rome, by Steph. Euod. Asseman. [Six vols. in all; vols. i. ii. iii., Gr. and Lat., 1732—43—46; vols. iv. v. vi., Syriac and Lat., 1737—40—43, fol.—Ephraem Syrus was a native of Nisibis, a monk and deacon of the church at Edessa. When elected bishop, he feigned himself deranged, and absconded, to avoid promotion. He was a most ardent devotee of monkery, a man of genius, and a prolific writer. His works consist of essays and sermons, chiefly on the monastic and moral virtues, commentaries on nearly the whole Bible, and hymns and prayers. A few of his essays are polemic. All his works were written in Syriac; and were so popular in Syria, as to be read in public after the Scriptures; and being early translated into Greek, were held in high estimation in that age. It is said that his hymns and prayers are still used in the Syrian churches. He died A.D. 378. See Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 115; Sozomen, *H. E.* iii. 16; Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 30, and iv. 29; Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* viii. 255, &c., and xv. 527, &c.; Milner's *Church History*, cent. iv. ch. 21. *Tr.*]

² [See notice of Pamphilus, cent. iii. p. ii. c. ii. § 8.]

³ [Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, was head of a monastic school, and presbyter at Antioch, where he had Chrysostom for a pupil. He became bishop of Tarsus in 378, sat in the general council at Constantinople in 381, and was succeeded at Tarsus by Phalerius before A.D. 394. He was a learned man, and a voluminous, though not an elegant writer. His works were chiefly scientific and controversial, in opposition to unbelievers; and explanatory of the Scriptures, which he construed literally. None of his works remain entire; but abstracts and numerous extracts are preserved by Photius and others. See Suidas, *voce* Διδωπος. Socrates, *H. E.* vi. 3. Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 2. Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 25. Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 119. Cave, *Histor. Litterar.* Fabricius,

Biblioth. Gr. vol. viii. p. 358, &c. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, viii. 558, &c., 802, &c. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* x. 247—251. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Hosius, bishop of Cordova in Spain, was born about the middle of the preceding century, became a bishop before the end of it, and sat in the council of Illiberis, A.D. 305. He was chief counsellor, in ecclesiastical affairs, to Constantine the Great, who summoned him to the council of Arles, in 314, and sent him to Egypt, to settle the religious disputes of that country, in 324. He stood at the head of the council of Nice, in 325; and presided in that of Sardica, in 347. By the Arian council of Sirmium, 356, he was banished when near a hundred years old; and unable to resist, he now signed an artfully drawn Arian creed; and died A.D. 361, having lived more than a hundred years, and been a bishop during about seventy. Nothing written by him remains, except an epistle to the emperor Constantius, preserved by Athanasius, in his *Historia Arianor. ad Monachos*. See Cave, *Histor. Litterar.* Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vii. 300—321, and Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* viii. 399. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Eustathius, a native of Side in Pamphylia, was bishop of Berrhœa (now Aleppo) in Syria, and promoted to the patriarchate of Antioch by the council of Nice, A.D. 325. He had previously distinguished himself as an opposer of Arianism, and in that council he acted a conspicuous part. This, together with his *Libri viii. contra Arianos*, rendered him extremely obnoxious to the abettors of Arianism, who procured his condemnation in one of their councils, about the year 330. Eustathius appealed in vain to the emperor, Constantine the Great; he was banished to Trajanopolis in Thrace, where he died about 360. The only entire works of his now extant are, his treatise on the witch of Endor, in opposition to Origen; and a short address to the emperor, delivered at the council of Nice. These, together with a treatise on the *Hexæmeron*, which is ascribed to him, were published by Leo Allatius, Lyons, 1629, 4to. What remains of his eight books against the Arians, was published by Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* viii. 170, &c. He was highly esteemed by the orthodox of his times. See Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 85. Chrysostom, *Laudatio Eustathii*, Opp. Chrysost. ii. 603.

of Alexandria;¹ *Amphilochius* of Iconium;² *Palladius*, author of the *Lausiac History*;³ *Macarius*, senior and junior;⁴ *Apollinaris*,

Athanasius, *Epist. ad Solitarios*; Cave, *Hist. Littérar.* Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclés.* vol. iii. Fabricius, *ubi supra*, p. 166, &c., and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* v. 275, &c. Tr.]

¹ [Didymus, a learned monk of Alexandria, and head of the catechetical school there, was the preceptor of Jerome and Rufinus. He lost his eyesight when young, yet became very conspicuous as a scholar and a theologian. He was born about 309, and was alive A.D. 392, then more than eighty-three years old. Of his numerous works, only three have reached us; namely, *de Spiritu Sancto Liber*, preserved in a Latin translation of Jerome (inter *Opp. Hieronymi*, iv. pt. i. 393, &c.). *Scholia on the canonical Epistles*, also in a Latin translation. Both these are given in the *Biblioth. Patr.* v. 320, 338. *Liber adversus Manichæos*; Gr. and Lat. in Combefis, *Auctarium noviss. Biblioth. Patr.* pt. ii. p. 21, &c. Besides these, he wrote commentaries on the greater part of the Bible; and, *de Trinitate libri iii.*; *contra Arianos libri ii.*; and a comment on the four books of Origen, *de Principiis*; in defence of Origen's sentiments. See Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 109; and Cave, *Historia Littéraria.* Tr.]

² [Amphilochius, after being a civil magistrate, and living awhile with Basil and Gregory Naz. in their monastery, was made bishop of Iconium, in Lycaonia, about 370 or 375. He sat in the second general council at Constantinople, A.D. 381; and in the same year was appointed, by the emperor Theodosius, inspector of the clergy in the diocese of Asia. Two years after, wishing to persuade the emperor to enact severer laws against the Arians, he appeared in his presence, without showing respect to his son, the young Arcadius. At this the emperor was indignant. The bishop replied: 'Sire, are you offended because indignity is offered to your son? Then, be assured, God must abhor those who treat his Son with disrespect.' The argument was irresistible, and the emperor granted his request. He probably died A.D. 395. Ten short pieces, chiefly orations, and various fragments, were published as his works, though most of them are of dubious origin, by Combefis, Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1644, fol., including the works of Methodius Patarensis and Andreas Cretensis. A few other tracts are extant under his name; and a considerable number, mentioned by the ancients, cannot now be found. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vii. 500—507; Oudin, *Commentar. de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* ii. 216, &c. Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xii. 67—70. Tr.]

³ [Palladius of Galatia, born A.D. 368; at the age of twenty went to Egypt, to get a practical knowledge of monkery. After residing among the monks of Egypt several years, his health failed, and he returned to Palestine, still leading a monastic life. In 400, on his going to Bithynia, Chrysostom ordained him bishop of Helenopolis, which he afterwards exchanged for Aspona in Galatia. After the fall of Chrysostom in 404, Palladius was banished, and died in exile about A.D. 431. His great work was composed about 420, and contains the history of the principal monks of his own times, with many of whom he was personally acquainted. Being written at the request of Lausus, the emperor's lord of the bed-chamber, it was called *Historia Lausiaca*. It is the honest statement of a credulous monk, who almost adored the heroes of his story. Several Latin editions have been published. In Greek it appeared, Lugd. Bat. 1616, 4to; and Gr. and Lat., in the *Auctar. Biblioth. Patr.* Paris, 1624, ii. 893—1053, fol., and in *Biblioth. Patr.* Paris, 1624, xiii.—Some additions were published by Cotelier, *Monument. Eccl. Gr.* t. iii. The other works ascribed to him are, *Dialogus de Vita S. Joh. Chrysostomi*, inter *Palladium Ep. Helenopolitanum et Theodorum ecclesiæ Romanæ diaconum* (extat inter *Opp. Chrysost.*), first published Gr. and Lat. by Emer. Bigot, Paris, 1680, and again 1738, 4to, with some other works. Whether the Palladius who wrote this was the author of the *Lausiac History*, has been questioned. A *Liber de Gentibus Indiæ et Branchmannis* is extant under his name, but is not supposed to be genuine.—See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* ix. 2, &c. Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs*, &c. Cave, *Historia Littérar.* Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xi. 500, &c. Tr.]

⁴ [Macarius senior, or the Great, called the Egyptian Macarius, a native of Thebais, was born A.D. 302, early addicted himself to a monastic life, at the age of thirty retired to the wilderness of Scetis, and the mountain Nitria, where he lived a hermit for sixty years. He became a presbyter at the age of forty, and died at the age of ninety, A.D. 391. Much is related of his austerities, his virtues, his wisdom, and his miracles. To him are ascribed, and, it is probable, correctly, seven *opuscula* and fifty homilies or discourses; all upon practical and experimental religion: edited, last, by J. G. Pritius, Gr. and Lat., Lips. 1714, 2 vols. in one, 12mo. pp. 285 and 566.—Macarius junior, called the Alexandrian Macarius, because he was born and spent the first part of his life at Alexandria, was con-

senior;¹ and a few others,² are most frequently mentioned on account of their learning, and events in which they were concerned.

temporary with Macarius senior, with whom he is often confounded. He was born about 304, pursued traffic some years, became a monk, retired to the wilderness of Scetis, was baptized at forty, became a presbyter, headed a numerous band of monks in the mountains of Nitria, and died about 404, aged 100 years. He was no less distinguished for his virtues and his miracles, than the other Macarius. Both copied St. Antony, both were hermits, inhabited the same region of country, and lived at the same time. But the senior Macarius was unsocial, especially with strangers; whereas the younger was very affable, and often visited the city of Alexandria; whence he was called *πολιτὺς*, *the citizen*. The younger wrote nothing, but a single letter to his disciples. The code of thirty monastic rules, ascribed to him, was probably the production of a later age. Both are mentioned by most of the contemporary writers, as Jerome, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, and especially Palladius (*Lausiaca History*, c. 19, 20), who was disciple of the younger Macarius. But this history is little more than an account of their rules of life, their conversations, their miraculous deeds, the admiration in which they were held, and the crowds of visitors and disciples which attended them. See Socrates, *H. E.* iv. 23. Palladius, *Hist. Lausiaca*, c. 19, 20. Rufinus, *Vitæ Patrum*, c. 28. Cassianus, *de Cenobior. Institut.* v. 41; and *Collat.* v. 12, xv. 3, xxiv. 13. Sozomen, *H. E.* iii. 14, vi. 29. Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 21. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, viii. 243, 264, 357. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vii. 491, &c. Cave, *Histor. Litterar. Tr.*

¹ [Apollinaris, or Apollinarius, senior, born at Alexandria, taught grammar at Berytus, and at Laodicea in Syria, where he became a presbyter. He associated with Epiphanius the sophist, a pagan, and attended his lectures; for which, both he and his son, the younger Apollinaris, were excommunicated. But repenting, they were restored. In 362, when the emperor Julian prohibited the Christians from reading the classic poets and orators, Apollinaris and his son undertook to compose some sacred classics, to supply the place of the pagan. The father took up the Old Testament, and transferred the Pentateuch into heroic verse, in imitation of Homer; and also, according to Sozomen, the rest of the Old Testament history he formed into Comedies, Tragedies, Lyrics, &c., in imitation of Menander, Euripides, and Pindar. The son laboured on the New Test., and transferred the Gospels and the canonical Epistles into Dialogues, in imitation of those of Plato. Nearly all,

if not the whole, of these sacred classics are lost. Yet there is extant a poetic Greek version of the Psalms, bearing the name of Apollinaris. The Tragedy of *Christ suffering*, published among the works of Gregory Naz., is also by some ascribed to the elder Apollinaris. The younger Apollinaris wrote likewise, *adversus Porphyrium*, libri xxx. *de Veritate*, *adv. Julianum et Philosophos*.; *contra Eunomii Apologiam Liber*; *Commentarii breves in Isaiam*; *Hymni et Cantica Sacra*; *de Incarnatione Libellus*; *de Fide Libellus*; and several Epistles, of which two perhaps are extant. Of all the rest of his works, only fragments remain. The younger Apollinaris believed that the divine nature in Christ did the office of a rational human soul; so that God the Word, a sensitive soul (*ψυχή*) and a body, constituted the person of the Saviour. For this he was accounted a heretic, and condemned by public councils. He died between 380 and 392. Both were learned and excellent men, and strenuous opposers of the Arian creed. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 104. Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 46, and iii. 16. Sozomen, *H. E.* v. 18, and vi. 25. Philostorg. *H. E.* viii. 11—15. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vii. 659, &c. viii. 332. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vii. Cave, *Histor. Litteraria. Tr.*]

² [Less distinguished than the foregoing were, in the Eastern or Greek church, the pseudo-Dorotheus, a fabled bishop of Tyre, who was a confessor in the Diocletian persecution, and a martyr under Julian, aged more than 100 years. To him is attributed the Epitome of the lives of the Prophets, Apostles, and the seventy Disciples of Christ; extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* iii. 421. See Cave, *Historia Litterar.*

Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 313—326, famous as beginning the controversy with Arius, who was his presbyter. Of more than seventy epistles, written by him on the Arian controversy, only two are extant: preserved, one by Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 4, and the other by Socrates, *H. E.* i. 6.

Constantine the Great, emperor A.D. 306—337. He wrote many epistles and some orations, which his secretaries translated into Greek. Of these, twenty-four Epistles and two orations are preserved by Eusebius and others, and among the acts of councils. Many of his edicts are also preserved in the *Codex Theodosianus*.

Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and afterwards court bishop of Constantinople, and the staunch patron of Arius. He was condemned in the council of Nice, and banished; retracted and was restored; became the great supporter of Arianism; and died A.D.

§ 10. Among the Latin writers, the following are most worthy of notice. *Hilary*, bishop of *Poitiers*, is famous for his twelve Books

342. A single epistle of his has been preserved by Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 6.

James, bishop of Nisibis in Syria; a confessor in the Diocletian persecution, an assessor in the Nicene council, and died in the reign of Constantius. He probably wrote wholly in Syriac; but his works were first published, Armenian and Latin, by N. Antonelli, Rome, 1756, fol. containing nineteen essays and discourses, chiefly on moral and practical subjects.

St. Antonius, a renowned Egyptian monk, who flourished about A.D. 330. His life, written by Athanasius, is still extant; likewise, his monastic rules, his remarks on cases of conscience, and about twenty Discourses. These *opuscula* were published in a Latin translation from Arabic, Rome, 1646, 8vo.

Asterius of Cappadocia, a fickle and ambitious man, in the period next following the Nicene council, and a zealous Arian. He was never admitted to the clerical office, possessed some talent, and wrote comments on the Scriptures, and tracts in favour of Arianism; of which only fragments remain.

Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia. He held a council at Ancyra in 315, and was conspicuous in the orthodox ranks at the council of Nice. Afterwards his zeal against Arianism carried him into Sabelianism. He was condemned and deposed in 335, acquitted in 347, but still regarded with suspicion. He died A.D. 370. Many wrote against him; and he wrote much, but nothing but what time has consumed.

Theodorus, bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, A.D. 334—347, a semi-Arian, and a zealous opposer of Athanasius. He died about the year 358. His commentaries on various parts of the Bible are highly commended by Jerome and others, for their style and erudition. All are lost, except his commentary on the Psalms, which is prefixed to the *Catenæ Veterum Patrum in Psalmos*, ed. Antwerp, 1643, 3 vols. fol.

Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, A.D. 340—366, successor to Eusebius, whose secretary he had been; a man of learning and eloquence, but unstable, and fluctuating between Arianism and orthodoxy. He wrote much, particularly in explanation of the Scriptures; but nothing that has been preserved.

Triphyllius, of Ledra in Cyprus, flourished A.D. 340. He was bred to the bar, and was considered one of the most elegant writers of his age. He wrote on the Canticles, and the life of Spyridon, his bishop; but nothing of his remains.

Eusebius, bishop of Emesa in Phœnicia, was born at Edessa, studied there, and at Alexandria in Egypt, and Antioch in Syria. As early as 312, he was distinguished for scholarship and for unassuming modesty. He refused the bishopric of Alexandria in 341; but soon after accepted that of Emesa, and died about A.D. 360. He leaned towards semi-Arianism; wrote much and elegantly on the Scriptures, and against the Jews. What has been published as his, has been much questioned.

George, bishop of Laodicea, a staunch Arian, and active in all their measures, from A.D. 335—360. He wrote against the Manicheans; the life of Eusebius Emesenus; and several epistles, one of which is preserved by Sozomen, *H. E.* iv. 13.

Pachomius (died 350), Theodorus, his successor, and Oresiesis, were distinguished contemporary monks of Tabennesis in Thebais, Egypt. They flourished from A.D. 340—350. Monastic rules, some epistles, and several discourses, are extant under the names of one or more of them.

Serapion, a monk of Thebais, distinguished for his learning and eloquence, was the friend of Athanasius, who made him bishop of Thmuis. He died about A.D. 358. Of his once popular writings, only his *Liber contra Manichæos* is extant; Latin, in the *Biblioth. Patr.* iv. 160.

Basil, bishop of Ancyra, from 336 to 360, was a semi-Arian, highly esteemed by Constantius, and very active against the orthodox. Contention between him and Acacius preceded his deposition and banishment to Illyricum in the year 360. He wrote much, and in particular against Marcellus, his predecessor; but none of his works are extant.

Leontius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, A.D. 348—358, a crafty and deceptive man, who was active in the contentions of his times. Of his writings, only a fragment of one discourse remains.

Marcus, an Egyptian bishop, and a friend of Athanasius, banished in 356, by George, bishop of Alexandria. He wrote an oration against the Arians, which is published, with Origen's tract on the Lord's prayer, by Wetstein, Amsterd. 1695, 4to.

Aëtius of Syria, a goldsmith, physician, deacon at Antioch, bishop somewhere, and finally a heretic. He held Christ to be a mere creature. He died about 366. His book, *de Fide*, in forty-seven chapters, is transcribed and refuted in Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 76.

Eudoxius, bishop of Germanicia on the Euphrates, and (356) of Antioch, and (360)

on the *Trinity*, and for other writings. He possessed a considerable degree of perspicuity and ingenuity, but he was often disposed to borrow from *Tertullian* and *Origen*, whom he greatly admired, rather than to tax his own genius.¹ *Lactantius*, the most eloquent of the

of Constantinople; died A.D. 370. He was successively an Arian, a semi-Arian, and an Aëtian; a learned, but a verbose and obscure writer. Large fragments of his discourse, *de Incarnatione Dei Verbi*, are extant.

Eunomius, the secretary and disciple of Aëtius, but more famous than his master. He was made bishop of Cyzicus A.D. 360, banished soon after, wandered much, and died about A.D. 394. He wrote on the epistle to the Romans, many letters, his own creed, and an Apology for it. Only the two last are extant. He held Christ to be a *created being*, and of a nature *unlike* to that of God.

Meletius, bishop of Sebastia in Armenia, and (361) of Antioch. He was banished A.D. 361, returned under Julian; was banished again under Valens, and restored by Gratian, and died while attending the general council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, at an advanced age. There is extant (in Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 73, c. 29—34) an able discourse, which he delivered at Antioch in 361, when, holding up *three* fingers, and then closing *two* of them, he said: 'We conceive there are *three persons*, but we address them as *one*.'

Titus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, was driven from his see, under Julian, A.D. 362; returned under Valentinian; and died about the year 371. He wrote *contra Manichæos libri iii.* which are extant in a Latin translation, in *Biblioth. Patr.* t. iv. [and in Syriac, edited by Dr. Lagarde. *Ed.*] A discourse, likewise, on the branches of palm, Gr. and Lat., and a commentary on Luke, in Latin, have been published under his name, but are questioned.

Paphnutius, a celebrated Egyptian monk, who flourished A.D. 370. He wrote the life of St. Onyphrius, and of several other monks, still extant.

Cæsarius, younger brother of Gregory Nazianzenus, was a learned physician of Constantinople, and was elevated to civil office. He is said to have written several works, and particularly a treatise against the pagans. There are extant, under his name, four Dialogues, Gr. and Lat. on 195 questions in theology; in Fronto le Duc's *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.* 1624, t. i. But they are supposed not to be his, as they show the head of a well-read theologian.

Eragrius, archdeacon of Constantinople, in 381, and after 385, an Egyptian monk. He was a pious and learned man, and a considerable writer. Several of his devo-

tional and practical works are extant, in the different collections of the works of the fathers.

Nemesius, bishop of Emesa, after being a Christian philosopher. He flourished A.D. 380, and, with Origen, held the pre-existence of human souls; as appears from his book, *de Natura Hominis*, extant in the *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.* 1624, t. ii. also printed Gr. and Lat. Oxford, 1671, 8vo.

Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople A.D. 381—398, orthodox and pious. One of his discourses is extant, *inter Opp. Chrysostomæ*, who was his successor.

Flavianus, a monk, and bishop of Antioch A.D. 381—403. He first divided the choir, and taught them to sing the Psalms of David responsively. He was strenuous against the Arians; but fragments only of his discourses and letters remain.

Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria A.D. 385—412, was famous for his contention with the Nitrian monks, and for his opposition to Origenism. Of his works only a few epistles, and considerable extracts from his other writings, are extant.

John, bishop of Jerusalem A.D. 386—416, famous for his contests with Epiphanius and with Jerome, respecting Origen's character. Numerous works, perhaps without foundation, are published as his. They consist of Commentaries on Scripture, and homilies. The homilies are printed among the works of Chrysostom; and the whole are published as his works, Brussels, 1643, 2 vols. fol.

Hieronymus of Dalmatia, a presbyter, and a monk, who flourished A.D. 386. He is author of Lives of the Egyptian Monks; the original Greek, though preserved, has not been published, because the Lausiac History of Palladius is nearly a literal translation of it.

Sophronius, the friend of Jerome, and translator into Greek of some of his works, particularly of his book *de Viris Illustribus*. He flourished about A.D. 390; and was, as Jerome says, 'apprime eruditus;' yet he is little noticed by other contemporary writers. *Tr.*]

¹ Concerning Hilary, the Benedictine monks have given an accurate account in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. [tom. i. pt. ii.] p. 139—193, [à Paris, 1733, 4to.] The best edition of his works is that of the French Benedictines, [by Coutant, Paris, 1693, fol. revised and improved by Scip. Maffei, Verona, 1730, 2 vols. fol.]

Latin Christians in this century, assailed the superstition of the pagans, in his *Divine Institutions*; and likewise wrote on other subjects. But he is more successful in confuting the errors of others, than in correcting his own.¹ *Ambrose*, first governor, and then bishop of *Milan*, is not rude in diction or conception, nor is he destitute of valuable thoughts; yet he is chargeable with the faults of the age, a deficiency in solidity, accuracy, and good arrangement.² *Jerome*, a monk of Palestine, has undoubtedly merited

Hilary of Poitiers was a native of Gaul, of respectable parentage, and well educated. He was a pagan till he had attained to manhood. His consecration to the episcopal office was about the year 350. For twenty years he stood pre-eminent among the Gallic bishops, and did much to arrest the progress of Arianism in the West. In the council of Beziers, A.D. 356, he handled the Arian bishops, Saturninus, Ursacius, Valens, and others, so roughly, that they applied to the emperor Constantius, and had him banished to Phrygia. During the four years he was an exile in Asia, he wrote most of his works, and was so active in opposing Arianism there, that the heretical clergy, to get rid of him, procured his release from banishment. He returned to his church a more able and more successful antagonist to the Gallic Arians than he was before. He was the principal means of rolling back the Arian current, which was sweeping over the West. His great work is his *de Trinitate libri xii.* He also wrote three different tracts addressed to the emperor; an account of the synods in the East against the Arians; concerning the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, and the events that followed to the year 366; Commentaries on Matthew, and on the Psalms. Besides these, he wrote several works which are lost, such as commentaries, hymns, epistles, &c. See *Jerome, de Viris Illustr.* c. 100. *Fortunatus, de Vita Hilarii*, libri ii. (prefixed to the *Opp. Hilarii*, ed. Bened.); *Coutant, Life of Hilary*, prefixed to the Benedictine edition of his works; *Tillemont, Mémoires*, vii. 442, &c. 745, &c.; and *Schroeckh, Kirchengesch.* xii. 253—342. Hilary was learned, but his style is exceedingly swollen and obscure. *Tr.*

¹ Of Lactantius also, the Benedictines have given an account, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, ii. 65, &c. His works have been through numerous editions; the latest and best are by the celebrated *Bunemann* [Lips. 1739, 8vo], the venerable *Heumann* [Gotting. 1736, 8vo], and *Lenglet du Fresnoy* [Paris, 1748, 2 vols. 4to, and *Zweyb.* 1786, 2 vols. 8vo. *Lucius Cælius Lactantius Firmianus* was probably a native of Italy; studied under *Arnobius* in Africa; removed to Nicomedia in the reign of Dio-

cletian, and opened a school for rhetoric, in which he had but few pupils. He was made private tutor or governor to *Crispus*, the eldest son of *Constantine the Great*, when an old man; and probably died a little before 330. He was learned, though not a profound theologian, and the most elegant of all the Latin fathers. Some think him the best writer of Latin after the days of *Cicero*. His works still extant are,—*Divinarum Institutionum libri vii.* written about 320. This is his great work. It may be called a Guide to true Religion, being designed to enlighten the pagans, and convert them to Christianity. *Institutionum Epitome*; an abridgment of the preceding. It is imperfect, extending over the three last books only. *De Ira Dei*, and *de Opificio Dei*, or on the works of creation, particularly on the physical structure and powers of man. These two works are, properly, a continuation of the first, being written in furtherance of the same designs. *De Mortibus Persecutorum*; an account of persecutors and persecutions, from *Nero* to *Maxentius*, A.D. 312. There is no good reason to doubt its genuineness. An English translation of this valuable treatise, with a long preface, was published by *Gilb. Burnet*, 1687, 18mo. *Symposium*; a juvenile performance, extant as the work of a fabled *Symposium*. The *Carmen de Phœnice* is perhaps his. His lost works are,—*Grammaticus*; ὁδοιπορικόν, a poetic account of his voyage to Nicomedia; *ad Asclepiadem* libri ii.; *ad Probum Epistolarum* libri iv.; *ad Severum Epistol.* libri ii.; *ad Demetrianum Epistol.* libri ii. See *Jerome, de Viris Illustr.* c. 80. *Cave, Historia Litterar.* *Lardner, Credibility*, &c. vol. vii. *Schroeckh, Kirchengesch.* v. 220—262. *Tr.*

² The Benedictine monks of France published his works in two large folio volumes [1686—1690. *Ambrose* was the son of a prætorian prefect of the same name, who was governor-general of Gaul, Britain, and Spain. After a good education for civil life, he became an advocate, counsellor to *Probus*, the prætorian prefect of Italy, and at last governor of Liguria and Æmilia, resident at Milan. In 374, *Auxentius*, bishop of Milan, died; and the Arians and orthodox became tumultuous in the church, when met

esteem from the Christian world by many of his productions; but at the same time, his bitterness towards those who differed from him, his eagerness after fame, his choleric and ungovernable temper, his unjust aspersions on good and innocent persons, and other defects of character, have disgraced him not a little, in the view of those who are neither uncandid nor incompetent judges. Among his various writings, those which interpret the Holy Scriptures, and his *epistles*, are the most valuable.¹ *Augustine*, bishop of *Hippo* in Africa, is

to elect a successor. Ambrose entered the church to quell the riot, and a little child happening to say, 'Ambrose bishop,' the mob presently cried out, 'Let him be the bishop.' He was constrained to submit; gave up all his property, and his worldly honours, was baptized, and became a laborious and self-denying bishop. An irruption of barbarians in 377 obliged him to flee; and he went to Illyricum, and thence to Rome. In 381, he presided in the council of Aquileia. In 383, the emperor Valentinian sent him as ambassador to Maximus the usurper in Gaul. Next came his contest with Symmachus, prefect of Rome, respecting the rebuilding the pagan altar of Victory in that city. In 386, he had much contention with the Arians of Milan. Afterwards he was sent on a second embassy to Maximus. Three years after, he debarred the emperor Theodosius the Great from Christian ordinances, and required him to do penance, for the slaughter of the citizens of Thessalonica by his order. In 392, civil war obliged him to leave Milan for a time. He soon returned, but died A.D. 397, aged sixty-four years. He was devout, energetic, orthodox, and a very useful bishop. His writings were numerous. On the Scriptures he wrote much. He wrote several treatises and discourses on monkery; *de Officiis* libri iii.; *de Mysteriis* liber; *de Sacramentis* libri v., which are greatly corrupted, if not altogether supposititious; *de Penitentia* libri ii.; also *de Fide*, or *de Trinitate* libri v.; and *de Spiritu Sancto* libri iii.; the two last were, in great measure, compilations from Greek fathers, and were addressed to the emperor Gratian. Several discourses and eulogies, and about ninety epistles, of his production, are extant; besides a great number of short sermons, scholia on the canonical epistles, and tracts of different kinds, which are falsely ascribed to him. His life is written by Paulinus, his private secretary. See *Opp. Ambrosii*, t. ii. Appendix, ed. Benedict. Cave, *Hist. Litt.* Tillemont, *Mémoires*, x. 78—306, 729, &c. G. Hermant, *Vie de S. Ambroise*, à Paris, 1678, 4to. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xiv. 148—332, and Jos. Milner, *Church History*, cent. iv. ch. 12—16, 18. *Tr.*]

¹ The defects of Jerome are learnedly

exposed by Jo. le Clerc, in his *Quæstiones Hieronymianæ*, Amstelod. 1700, 12mo. His works have been published by the Benedictines [ed. Martianay, Paris, 1693—1706], in five volumes folio. This edition was republished, with considerable additions [and improvements in the arrangement, the prefaces, and the explanatory notes] by Vallarsius, Verona [1734—43, eleven volumes, folio.—Hieronymus Stridonensis, or Jerome of Stridon in Dalmatia, was born of Christian parents, about 331. His father, Eusebius, gave him the best advantages for education. He was early sent to Rome, where he studied many years, and under the best masters. About 363 he was baptized, and left Rome to travel for improvement in knowledge. He journeyed through Gaul, and resided a few years at Treves, where he became a monk, and devoured many books. On his return he spent some time at Aquileia, where he formed a close friendship with Rufinus. In 373 he left Aquileia, and embarked for Syria, in company with several friends, and carrying his own large collection of books. Landing in Thrace, he passed the Bosphorus, and travelled overland to Antioch. Here his friend Innocentius died, and he himself was dangerously sick. After recovering, he was induced by a dream to renounce for ever the reading of the pagan classics. From Apollinaris the younger he obtained farther instruction in biblical interpretation. In 374 he retired into the wilderness eastward of Antioch; and, supported by his friends, he there spent about four years in the character of a learned hermit and author, who, nevertheless, held correspondence with the world, and took part in the passing religious controversies. In 378 or 379, he returned to Antioch, and was ordained a presbyter. The next year he visited Constantinople, to enjoy the instructions of Gregory Nazianzen. Here he continued two or three years, formed a better acquaintance with the Greek fathers, and translated some of their works; in particular, Eusebius' *Chronicon*, which he continued down to A.D. 378; and Origen's *Homilies on Jeremiah*. In 382 he accompanied Paulinus and Epiphanius to Rome, respecting the contests in the church of Antioch. Damasus, bishop of Rome, was

one whose fame is spread throughout the Christian world. And he certainly possessed many and great excellences, a superior genius, an unfailling love of truth, admirable patience of labour, unquestionable piety, with a delicacy and an acuteness by no means contemptible. But his power of judging was not equally great; and often a sort of constitutional warmth had more power over this excellent man than reason and prudence. He has, therefore, afforded many, abundant means for controversy on his real sentiments, and others, for taxing him with inconsistency, and a headlong speed in writing upon subjects insufficiently considered.¹ *Optatus of Milevis*, an

much pleased with him, employed him occasionally as a private secretary, and prompted him to write on several biblical subjects, and, at length, to undertake a correction of the vulgar Latin Bible. Jerome likewise did much to promote monkery in Italy. But the ardour that he kindled upon this subject among the Roman ladies, created him enemies among the other sex. He also gave offence to the clergy of Rome, and thought it best to leave Italy in 385, and return to the East, with Paula, and Eustochium her daughter, wealthy Roman ladies, whom he had rendered enthusiastic in regard to monastic institutions. He first went to Antioch, and thence to Jerusalem, where he and his ladies performed a winter's pilgrimage. In the spring of 386 they went to Alexandria, and thence to visit the Nitrian monks. Returning the same year to Palestine, they took up their permanent residence at Bethlehem. Here Paula erected four monasteries, three for nuns, and one for monks. In this last, Jerome passed the remainder of his days in reading, composing books, and contending with all who presumed to differ from him on any subject in which he took interest. He is said to have died on the 30th of September, A.D. 420, aged ninety years. Jerome was the best informed of all the Latin fathers, in *sacred literature*. The Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, were all familiar to him; and he had a very extensive acquaintance with the best writers of both the Latin and the Greek churches. He likewise possessed genius, industry, and literary enterprise, in no ordinary degree. He was also acute and discriminating; but his vivid imagination, and his choleric temper, which scorned all restraint, rendered him caustic and abusive. When he has no antagonist, and sees no enemy, he is a charming writer, yet enthusiastic, and often hasty and injudicious. The greater part of his works, and particularly his translations and commentaries on the Bible, were written at Bethlehem. As given to us in the Benedictine edition, in five volumes, Vol. I. contains his translations of the whole Bible; the canonical books of the O. T. from the

Hebrew; Job, Psalms, Tobit, and Esther, translated from the Greek; and the whole N. T. with copious notes, from the Greek. Vol. II. contains some glossaries, and numerous tracts and letters on a variety of subjects in sacred literature. Vol. III. contains his commentaries on all the prophets. Vol. IV. contains his commentary on Matthew, and on the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, and Philemon; and about 120 Letters and Essays, narrative, polemic, apologetic, &c. The fifth vol. contains only works falsely ascribed to Jerome. See Cave, *Hist. Lit. Tillmont, Mémoires*, xii. 1—356. Martianay, *Vie de St. Jérôme*, Paris, 1706, 4to. J. Stilling, *Acta Sanctor.* Septembris, viii. 418—688, Antw. 1762, fol. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xi. 3—239. J. Milner, *Church Hist.* cent. iv. ch. 10. *Tr.*]

¹ After the edition by the theologians of Louvain [Antwerp, 1577, 10 vols. fol.] the Benedictine monks gave a neat and accurate edition of Augustine's work [Paris, 1689—1700, 11 vols. fol.] This was reprinted, with enlargements, in Holland, or, as the title says, at Antwerp, under the eye of Jo. le Clerc, with the assumed name of Jo. Phereponus [1700—1703, 12 vols. fol. Amsterdam; reprinted at Venice, 1729—1735.] The Jesuits censure many things in the Benedictine edition. [They think the editors leaned too much towards the Jansenists.—Aurelius Augustinus was born Nov. 13, A.D. 354, at Tagaste, an obscure village in Numidia. His father, Patricius, was a pagan, till near the close of life. His mother, Monica, was eminently pious. He had a good school education in grammar and rhetoric, but he would not study Greek. At fifteen he came home, and lived idle and vicious. At seventeen he was sent to Carthage, where he shone as the first scholar in the rhetorical school. But he was dissipated, and became a Manichean. He kept a mistress, who bore him a son when he was but eighteen. This son, named Adeodatus, was well educated, became pious, was baptized at the same time with his father, at the age of fifteen, and died

African, has obtained considerable reputation, by his work, not inelegantly written, *on the Schism of the Donatists*.¹ *Paulinus* of Nola has left us some epistles and poems, which are neither very bad nor very good.² *Rufinus*, a presbyter of *Aquileia*, acquired fame by

soon after. While a student at Carthage, Augustine lost his father. By reading Cicero's *Hortensius*, he became enamoured with philosophy, and began to seek it in the Bible; but not finding there that sublime system of which Cicero had given him an ideal, he threw aside the sacred volume. At the age of twenty, he had read and mastered nearly all the liberal sciences, as they were then taught. He now returned to Tagaste, and there opened a school for rhetoric. About 380, he again settled at Carthage, where he taught rhetoric about three years. During this period, his attachment to Manichæism diminished. He was restless, debauched, and unprincipled; yet was a fine scholar, and quite popular. In 383 he went to Rome, and the next year to Milan, in the character of a teacher of rhetoric. The eloquence of Ambrose drew him to attend public worship; and under the discourses of that able and faithful preacher, Augustine's mind was gradually enlightened, and his conscience awakened. He had sharp and painful convictions, and became altogether a new man. He was baptized A.D. 387, set out for Africa the same year, buried his mother, stopped at Rome, and did not reach Africa till A.D. 388. He sold his estate, and devoted the avails to charitable purposes; and for three years lived as a recluse, with a few devout young men; and spent much time on scientific and metaphysical subjects. In 391, he went to Hippo regius (now Bona in Algiers), where he was made a presbyter, and preached and laboured with great success. Four years after, Valerius, his aged bishop, who was a native Greek, and who felt the need of such an assistant, caused him to be ordained his colleague bishop. From 395 to 430, Augustine, as bishop of Hippo, was indefatigable in preaching, writing, combating error and vice, and infusing life and spirituality into the churches and clergy, far and near. He died on the 28th of August, 430, aged seventy-six years. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xiii. ed. Paris (it is omitted in the Brussels ed.) J. Stilling, *Acta Sanctorum*, Augusti, vi. 213—460; Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xv. 219—530; Jos. Milner's *Church Hist.* cent. v. ch. 2—9; and especially *Augustini Confessionum libri xiii.*; written about 400; Opp. i. ed. Benedict. — The works of Augustine are so numerous, that even their titles cannot be here enumerated. Volume I. of the Benedictine edition,

contains his *Retractions*, or corrections of his own works, in two books, written A.D. 426; his *Confessions*, in 13 books; and 13 works composed before he was a presbyter, on scientific, moral, and polemic subjects. Vol. II. contains 270 Epistles. Vol. III. contains 16 Treatises on Biblical questions and subjects. Vol. IV. contains his *Exposition of the Psalms*. Vol. V. contains 394 of his popular sermons, and 317 falsely ascribed to him. Vol. VI. contains 31 Tracts on moral, monastic, and practical subjects. Vol. VII. is occupied by his 22 books *de Civitate Dei*, or history of the visible kingdom of God, from the creation to his own times; — a most learned work. Vols. VIII., IX., and X., contain his polemic works; against the Manichees, the Arians, the Antitrinitarians, the Origenists, the Jews; the Donatists; and the Pelagians. The eleventh vol. contains his life, indices, &c. *Tr.* — Cave says that Augustine was not made bishop until 396, and then against his will; he considering his appointment uncanonical. He was set apart for it by Megalius of Calama, primate of Numidia. *S.*]

¹ After the edition of Gab. Albaspinæus, [Paris, 1631, and 1679, fol.] Lud. Ell. du Pin, doctor of the Sorbonne, published the works of Optatus, with judicious illustrations, [Paris, 1700, fol. — Of Optatus, all that is known is stated by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 110; namely, 'that he was an African, and bishop of Milevis, who was on the side of the Catholics; and that he wrote, during the reign of Valentinian and Valens (A.D. 364—375), six books against the slander of the Donatists; in which he maintains that the wrong-doing of the Donatists is erroneously charged on us.' His work is entitled, *Contra Parmenianum sectæ Donatistice apud Carthaginem episcopum, de Schismate Donatistarum Libri vii.* It is a polemic work, in answer to a book by Parmenianus; and contains much of the history of that schism, as well as of the arguments by which each party maintained its own principles, and defended its own conduct. *Tr.*]

² The best edition of Paulinus is that published by Jo. Bapt. le Brun, Paris, 1685, 4to, [in two volumes: which L. A. Muratori republished with some additions, Verona, 1736, fol. — Meropius Pontius Anicius Paulinus, a Roman of patrician rank, was born at Bourdeaux A.D. 353. He first studied under the poet Decius Ausonius; then, went to Rome, became a popular advocate, and was

translating into Latin various works of the Greek fathers, in particular of *Origen*; by his bitter contests with *Jerome*; and by some expositions of the Holy Scriptures. His would have been no ignoble place among the Latin writers of this century, had he not met with an adversary so powerful and abusive as *Jerome*.¹ For an account

made consul about 375. About 379, he commenced his travels in Italy, Gaul, and Spain, accompanied by his pious wife Therasia. During this period he formed acquaintance with St. Ambrose, St. Martin, and many other eminent saints. He was baptized at Bourdeaux, A.D. 391; and gradually parting with most of his large estate, in charity, he retired to Barcelona in Spain, where he lived as a recluse. In 393 he was ordained a presbyter at Barcelona. The next year he removed to Nola in Campania, where he had a small estate near to the grave and the church of St. Felix, at which numerous miracles were supposed to take place, and which, of course, was a great resort of the admirers of sacred relics and wonders. Here Paulinus, in 402, erected an additional church, which he adorned with emblems of the Trinity, and other religious devices. In 409 he became bishop of Nola, and remained in that office till his death in 431. He was esteemed one of the greatest saints; and was undoubtedly very religious, though superstitious. He left about fifty letters to his friends, written with a pleasing simplicity of style, and exhibiting a true picture of his devout mind, yet containing little that is of much importance; also thirty-two poetic effusions, of a similar character with his letters; fifteen of which are in praise of St. Felix. He was highly esteemed by his contemporaries, and by the pious in after-ages. For an account of him and his works, see Gennadius, *de Viris Illustribus*, c. 48, with the Notes of Fabricius in his *Biblioth. Patristica*; Le Brun, *Vita Paulini*, in his *Opp. Paulini*; Cave, *Historia Litterar. Schroeeckh, Kirchengesch.* vii. 123—132; Jos. Milner, *Church Hist.* century v. ch. 13. *Tr.*]

¹ Richard Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiast.* par M. du Pin, i. 124, &c. A particular and full account is given of him, and his reputation is defended, by Justus Fontanus, *Historia Litteraria Aquileiensis*, lib. v. p. 149. [See also P. Th. Cacciari, *Dissertatio Historica de Vita, Fide, &c. Rufini*, subjoined to his edition of Rufinus' *Hist. Eccl.* and De Rubeis, *Dissert. de Tyrannio Rufino Presbytero, &c.* Venice, 1754, 4to.—Gennadius, *de Viris Illust.* c. 17. Schroeeckh, *Kirchengesch.* x. 112—133. Cave, *Hist. Lit.*—Rufinus Toranius, or Tyrannius, was probably born at Concordia, near Aquileia, about A.D. 330. After living several years in a monastery at Aquileia, and forming acquaintance with

Jerome, he was baptized there in 371. Soon after, the fame of the oriental monks led him to visit them. Landing at Alexandria, he became acquainted with a rich Roman lady, named Melania, who was as great an admirer of monkery as himself. She became his patron, supported him, and travelled with him, through the remainder of his life. During his six years' residence in Egypt, he spent some time among the monks in the Nitrian wilderness, and also heard lectures from the famous Didymus of Alexandria. About 378, he and Melania removed to Jerusalem, where they spent many years. Melania occupied a nunnery, in which she supported a considerable number of devout sisters. Rufinus resided with other monks in cells about the mount of Olives; was much respected; often visited by pilgrims; and lived in the greatest intimacy with Jerome, who was then at Bethlehem. About 390, he was ordained a presbyter, by John, bishop of Jerusalem; and soon after, the quarrel between him and Jerome, respecting Origen's orthodoxy, commenced. In 397, that controversy seemed to subside, and shortly after Rufinus and Melania removed to Rome. Here his publications concerning Origen rekindled the quarrel with Jerome; and both Origen and Rufinus were pronounced in the wrong by pope Anastasius. In 399, Rufinus removed to Aquileia, where he spent several years in translating works of Origen, and writing apologies for him and for himself. At length, after Alaric and his Goths began to lay waste all Italy, Rufinus and Melania set out for Palestine, and got as far as Sicily, where Rufinus died A.D. 410.—Rufinus was a man of respectable talents, of considerable learning, a handsome writer, and a very diligent scholar. His orthodoxy and piety ought never to have been called in question. The abusive treatment that he received from Jerome, will account for the irritation of his feelings at times, without supposing him destitute of grace.—The work of his which is most frequently quoted in modern times, is his *Ecclesiastical History*. The first nine books are a free translation of the ten books of Eusebius, with considerable omissions in the latter part, and some additions in the first seven books. The two last books (the tenth and eleventh) are a continuation by Rufinus. This work has been very severely censured; but of late it is held to be of some value. The first good edition of it

of *Philastrius*,¹ *Damasus*,² *Juvenius*,³ and other writers of less note, the reader is referred to those who professedly treat of all the Christian writers. I will, however, just mention *Sulpitius Severus*,⁴

was by P. Th. Cacciari, Rome, 1740, 2 vols. 4to.—Besides this, Rufinus wrote *Vita Patrum*, or a history of the eastern monks; often published, and of about the same value as the other works of the kind: an exposition of the Creed; the best that has reached us, from so early an age: two Apologies for Origen, and a translation of Pamphilus' Apology for him: two defences of himself against Jerome, one of which is lost: Commentaries on seventy-five of the Psalms, and on Hosea, Joel, and Amos,—if they are genuine.—He translated the works of Josephus; the *Recognitions* of Clement; various Commentaries of Origen, and his four books *de Principiis*; several works of Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Anatolius, and Evagrius.—An imperfect collection of his works was published by De la Barre, Paris, 1680, fol. A much better edition, in 2 vols. fol. was commenced at Verona, by Domin. Vallarsi, of which the first vol. appeared in 1745. *Tr.*]

¹ [Philastrius, or Philaster, bishop of Brescia in the north of Italy, A. D. 379—387. While a presbyter, he is said to have travelled nearly all over the Roman empire, combating and endeavouring to convert errorists of every sort, and especially Arians. At Milan he was severely handled by Auxentius, the Arian bishop. Ambrose, the successor of Auxentius, showed him kindness, and ordained him bishop of Brescia. His praises are told by Gaudentius, his immediate successor in the see of Brescia. His only work is, *de Hæresibus Liber*, in 150 chapters. It enumerates more heresies than any of the other ancient works; but no one considers it an accurate and able work. Philastrius was doubtless a pious and well-meaning man; but he was incompetent to the task that he undertook. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* ix. 362—384. The work is extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* iv. 701, and ed. Helmstadt, 1611, 4to. and by J. A. Fabricius, Hamb. 1721, 8vo, and among the collected Works of the early bishops of Brescia, Brixia, 1738, fol. *Tr.*]

² [Damasus, bishop of Rome, A. D. 366—384, is said to have been of Spanish descent, but his father was a presbyter of Rome; and he was probably born there about 305. On the death of Felix, A. D. 366, there was great competition for the episcopal chair; and two bishops were chosen and ordained, namely, Damasus and Ursinus or Ursicinus. Much confusion and even bloodshed followed. But the party of Damasus finally triumphed. Damasus was

active in putting down Arianism in the West; and being requested, he aided the eastern churches in healing their divisions. For these purposes he held several councils, and wrote several letters, some of which are extant. Two synodic epistles and a confession of faith are preserved by Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 22, and v. 10, 11. An epistle to Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, and about forty epitaphs, inscriptions, epigrams, &c. are also extant. His book, *de Virginitate*, is lost. Several spurious epistles, as well as the *Liber Pontificalis*, or Brief History of the Popes, are falsely ascribed to him. The best edition of his works is that by A. M. Merenda, Rome, 1754, fol. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 103. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 179—233, ed. 2nd, Lond. 1749. Merenda, in his ed. of the works of Damasus, and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* viii. 107—122. *Tr.*]

³ [Caius Vettius Aquilinus Juvenius. Nearly all that is known of the man is told by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 84. He says: 'Juvenius, of noble descent, a Spaniard, and a presbyter, composed four books, in which the four Gospels are put into hexameter verse, almost verbatim; also some poems in the same measure, relating to the order of the sacraments. He flourished under the emperor Constantine.' The four books of Evangelical History are an imperfect harmony of the Gospels, on the basis of Matthew. Juvenius possessed considerable poetic genius, and understood versification very well. His lines are flowing and easy; but he was more solicitous to give the history truly, and as nearly as possible in the language of the Bible, than to decorate the narrative by flights of fancy and poetic imagery. The best edition is that of Erh. Reusch, Franck. and Leips. 1710, 8vo. The other poems mentioned by Jerome are lost. But in the *Nova Collectio vet. Monumentorum*, ix. 15, &c. by Edm. Martene, Paris, 1724—33, there is a poetic version of the book of Genesis, which bears the name of Juvenius. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* v. 262—265. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Sulpitius Severus was born in Aquitain, of noble descent, and brought up under Phæbadius, bishop of Agen. In his youth he studied eloquence, and afterwards became an advocate, and married a lady of consular rank. Subsequently he became a monk under St. Martin, and a presbyter at Primuliacum, a village between Narbonne and Toulouse. He was intimate with St. Martin of Tours, Paulinus of Nola, and

a Gaul, who wrote history better than any other in this age; and *Prudentius*, a Spanish poet of considerable merit.

Jerome. In his old age, Gennadius tells us, he was entangled by the metaphysics of the Pelagians; but recovering himself, he ever after kept silence. He is supposed to have died about A.D. 420, far advanced in life. His style is chaste and neat, much beyond the age in which he lived: whence he has been called the *Christian Sallust*. His best work is a Church History, *Historia Sacra*, in two books, from the creation to A.D. 400. It is a condensed narrative, in a very classic style, and composed with some ability and fidelity. Besides this he wrote the Life of St. Martin; three epistles concerning him; and three dialogues on the miracles of the oriental monks, and on those of St. Martin. Several epistles of his are lost. To him Paulinus of Nola addressed fourteen epistles, which are still extant. His works have been often printed. The last edition, perhaps, is that of G. Hornius, Lugd. Bat. 1647, 4to; often reprinted, 8vo. See Gennadius, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 19. Cave, *Hist. Lit. Tr.*

¹ [Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, of Spain, was born A.D. 348; but whether at Tarragona, Calahorra, or Saragossa, is not settled. In his youth he studied eloquence, and afterwards managed causes and filled civil offices, as an unprincipled man. He was openly vicious, and he served some time in the army. At length, when turned of fifty, he became thoughtful, his whole character was changed, and he devoted himself to writing moral and religious poetry. In 405, he wrote *καθημερινῶν* (*liber*), or twelve Latin hymns, adapted to our daily devotions. His other poems are *ψυχομαχία*, or the conflict between virtues and vicious passions; *περὶ στεφάνων*, or fourteen elegies on various martyrs; *ἀποθέσις*, or on the divine nature, in opposition to pagans and heretics; *ἀμαρτιγενεία*, or the origin of sin; two books against Symmachus, and the worship of idols; and (if it be genuine) *διπτοχάιον*, or a *dessert*, taken from the Old and New Testaments; some write it *διπτυχον*, the *Diptych*, or *list of saints* in the Old and New Testaments. His commentary on the hexaëmeron is lost. Prudentius was something of a poet; but has been greatly overrated. His diction is not pure, nor his versification correct, and his thoughts are often prosaic and lengthy. A good critic has observed, that he was a better Christian than a poet. Yet he has many agreeable passages, and some that are really fine. He also serves to illustrate the history and the religious views of the age in which he lived. His collected works were published by Weitz, Hanov. 1613, 8vo; with notes

by Heinsius, Amstelod. 1667, 12mo; and in usum Delphini, Paris, 1687, 4to.—See Gennadius, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 13. Cave, *Hist. Litterar.* Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vii. 100—123.

The Latin writers of inferior note, omitted by Mosheim, are the following.

Anastasia, a noble Roman lady, the wife of Publius, and a martyr in 303. Two letters addressed from her prison to Chrysogonus, a confessor, are extant under her name. See Suidas, *in voce Χρυσόγονος*.

Theonas, a bishop, probably of Alexandria, 282—300. An excellent letter of his, addressed to Lucian, the emperor's chamberlain, is extant in Latin, in D'Achery, *Addit. ad Spicileg.* tom. xi. or the new ed. tom. iii. p. 297. See Cave, *Histor. Litterar.* i. 172, 173.

Rheticus, bishop of Autun in France. He was in high esteem during the reign of Constantine; and wrote on the Canticles, and against the Novatians; his works are lost. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 82.

Donatus, an African bishop, from whom the *Donatist faction* took its name. According to Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* c. 93), he wrote many tracts in support of his sect, and likewise a book on the Holy Spirit, which accorded with Arian views. None of his works are extant. He was expelled from Carthage, A.D. 356.

Julius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 337—352, a strenuous opposer of the Arians, and a patron of Athanasius. Two of his epistles are extant; one addressed to the oriental bishops, and the other to the Alexandrians, in favour of Athanasius. Both are preserved in the works of Athanasius, and the latter also by Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. c. 23. See Cave, *Histor. Litterar.*, and Bower, *Lives of the Popes*. [There are some other letters ascribed to Julius in Mai, *Scr. Nova Coll.* vii. 165. Jaffé, p. 15. *Ed.*]

Julius Firmicus Maternus probably was first a pagan, and then a Christian. He wrote a book on the falsehood of the pagan religions, addressed to the emperors Constantius and Constans, which has been often printed. There are extant, likewise, eight books on astronomy or mathematics, which bear his name.

Fortunatianus, born in Africa, and for many years bishop of Aquileia. After contending long and strenuously against the Arians, he joined them in 354, and became as active against the orthodox. He wrote commentaries on the Gospels: but nothing of his remains.

Vitellius, an African Donatist, about A.D. 344. He wrote on the world's hatred to

the servants of God; against the pagans; against the Catholics as traditors, and some other tracts. See Gennadius, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 4. Nothing of his remains.

Macrobius of Africa. As a catholic presbyter, he wrote a book addressed to confessors and virgins; afterwards, as a Donatist bishop resident at Rome, he composed the martyrdom of Maximianus and Isaac, two Donatists. A large fragment of the last is extant in Mabillon, *Analect.* t. iv. He flourished A.D. 344.

Liberius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 352—366. He had a warm discussion with the emperor Constantius, in the year 355, at Milan, respecting the persecution of the orthodox by the Arians, for his opposition to which he was banished. During his exile he relapsed, signed an Arian creed, and was restored, A.D. 358. His dialogue with the emperor at Milan is extant in Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 16; for his epistles, see Mansi, iii. 200; Labbé, ii. 743.

Eusebius Vercellensis was a native of Sardinia, and first a lector at Rome, then bishop of Vercelli in the north of Italy, A.D. 354. For his vigorous opposition to the Arian cause, he was banished in 355, first to Scythopolis in Syria, thence to Cappadocia, and afterwards to Thebais in Egypt. Under Julian he regained his liberty, travelled extensively in the eastern provinces, was at several councils, and, returning to Italy, died A.D. 371. He translated the commentary on the Psalms by Eusebius Cæsariensis into Latin; but it is lost; and wrote four letters, which are still extant. A manuscript of the four Evangelists, according to the old Italic version, written with his own hand, is preserved in the archives of the church of Vercelli, and was published by J. A. Irici, Milan, 1748.

Lucifer of Cagliari, a bishop in Sardinia, contemporary with Eusebius Vercellensis, and his companion in exile. He was founder of the sect called Luciferians, who held no communion with Arians, or even with such as had been Arians. Lucifer was a man of violent passions, and bold even to rashness. He addressed two indecorously written books to the emperor Constantius; and wrote likewise, *On apostate Princes; On having no intercourse with heretics; On showing no indulgence to offenders against God; That life is to be sacrificed for the Son of God;* and a short *Epistle to Florentinus*. These were published, Paris, 1568, 8vo, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* iv. 181; but the best edition is by Joh. Dominic and Ja. Coleti, Venice, 1778, fol.

Hilarius, a native of Sardinia, deacon at Rome, and associated with Eusebius Vercell. and Lucifer of Cagliari in an embassy to Constantius, and by him sent with them into exile. He became a Luciferian. To him

are attributed—though without sufficient proof—the Questions on the Old and New Testaments, printed among the works of Augustine, vol. iv., and the Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul, published among the works of Ambrose.

Phæbadius, bishop of Agen, in the south of France, from, at least, 359—392. He was famous, in connexion with the three preceding, in the Arian contests in the West. His Book against the Arians is extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* iv. 300, ed. Paris, 1589; and by Casp. Barth, Francf. 1623, 8vo.

Zeno, bishop of Verona, about A.D. 390. To him are ascribed ninety Sermons on various texts and subjects, which were compiled from Basil, Hilary, and others. They are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* iii. 359.

Fabius Marius Victorinus, of African birth, was a distinguished pagan rhetorician, at Rome, who became a convert to Christianity about the middle of this century, and died about A.D. 370. While a pagan he wrote or translated several treatises on philosophy, grammar, and rhetoric: most of which are lost. After his conversion, he wrote on the Holy Trinity; against the Arians, four books; to Justin the Manichæan, against the Manichæan principle of two first causes; on the commencement of the day, whether it be at evening, or in the morning; on the generation of the divine Word; against Candidus the Arian; three hymns; on embracing the *homoousian* faith; a poem on the seven Maccabees; and commentaries on some of Paul's epistles, which were never published. His style is intricate, obscure, and inelegant. Most of what he wrote after his conversion is extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, iv. 293. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 101, and the Notes of J. A. Fabricius.

Candidus, an Arian, about A.D. 364. He composed a book on the divine generation, addressed to F. M. Victorinus, which, with the answer of Victorinus, was published by Andr. Rivinus, Gothæ, 1656.

Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona in Spain, who flourished about the year 370, and died before A.D. 390. He wrote a book called *Cervus*, which is lost; also three epistles against the Novatians; an exhortation to penitence; and a tract on baptism, addressed to catechumens; all of which were published, Paris, 1638, 4to; Rome, 1564, fol. *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. iv., and still better, in Aguirre, *Collectio Max. Concil. Hispan.* ii. 79, &c.

Anicia Falconia Proba, a noble lady of Rome, distinguished for her rank, her piety, and her beneficence. She flourished about A.D. 370. After the death of her husband, she lost most of her property by the incursion of the Goths, and fell into the hands of Alaric, who carried her to Africa, where she

died early in the fifth century. Her *Cento Virgilianus de rebus Divinis* is extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, v. 1218, and Cologne, 1601, 8vo, and Halle, 1719, 8vo.

Faustinus, a presbyter among the Luciferians at Rome, A.D. 384. He wrote a petition to the emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius; to which is prefixed a Confession of faith; and subjoined is the Rescript of Theodosius. He also wrote a book on the Trinity, against the Arians. His works are in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, v. 673, and were printed, Oxford, 1678, 8vo.

Siricius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 385—398, is the earliest Roman pontiff whose Decretal Epistles are allowed to be genuine. Five of his epistles are in the *Acta Concilior.* tom. ii.; but the fourth, which is addressed to the bishops of Africa, is demonstrably spurious. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* viii. 122—129; and Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 233—277.

Idacius Clarus was a Spanish bishop; perhaps of Merida, A.D. 385. He was conspicuous as an opposer of the Priscillianists; suffered banishment; and wrote an *Apologeticus*, which is lost; a book against Virimundus, an Arian deacon; Explanation of some difficult passages of Scripture; and other tracts against heresies; all of which are extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, v. 726.

Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, in northern Italy (a different person from Gaudentius, a contemporary Donatist bishop of Tamugada in Africa), was travelling in the Asiatic provinces, when he was elected successor to Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, and was compelled to return and accept the office. He brought with him, from the

East, relics of about forty saints; and served the church till A.D. 410, or, as some say, till 427. He wrote fifteen discourses or tracts on various subjects; also, On the unjust steward; On the text, 'My Father is greater than I;' and the Life of Philastrius: all published, Patav. 1720, 4to.

Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, A.D. 390—426, was a man of much influence, and wrote, A.D. 419, a circular Epistle on the condemnation of Pelagius and Cœlestius; which, with the letter of the emperor Honorius to him, on the same subject, is in Baronius, *Annals*, A.D. 419, p. 455, and in the *Concil. Collect.* ii. 1609.

Tichonius, or Tychonius, flourished A.D. 390. He was a learned, moderate Donatist; and wrote Seven Rules for interpreting Scripture (extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, vi. 49). Three books on intestine war; Explanation of divers causes; and a Commentary on the Apocalypse. Some have supposed the eighteen Lectures on the Apocalypse, printed among the works of Augustine, to be this Commentary of Tichonius. See Gennadius, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 18. Augustine, *de Doctrina Christiana*, l. iii. c. 30, and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xi. 374—382.

Petilianus, a leading Donatist bishop in Numidia, A.D. 399. He wrote *de uno Baptismo*; and a circular epistle to his party: to both which Augustine wrote formal answers. His works are lost.

Faustus, a Manichæan bishop in Africa, A.D. 400. He wrote a book against the orthodox faith; which Augustine quotes entire, and refutes at large in thirty-three books. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. State of theological learning — § 2. Increase of superstition — § 3. Hence innumerable pious frauds — § 4. Interpreters of the sacred volume — § 5. Mode of explaining the Christian doctrines — § 6. Doctrinal writers — § 7. State of controversial theology — § 8. Disingenuous methods of disputing — § 9. The principal disputants — § 10. Practical theology — § 11. Faults of the moral writers — § 12. The number of mystics increased, and their doctrines established — § 13, 14. Monkish societies — § 15. Different orders of monks — § 16. Two pernicious moral doctrines — § 17. Lives and morals of Christians — § 18. Controversy with Meletians — § 19. The Eustathian troubles — § 20. The Luciferians — § 21. The Aërian controversy — § 22. Jovinianus — § 23. Controversies relating to Origen — § 24. Their extension — § 25. Controversy respecting his writings.

§ 1. THAT the elementary principles of the Christian religion were preserved entire and inviolate in most churches is certain; but it is equally certain, that they were very often unskilfully and confusedly explained and defended. This is manifest from the discussions concerning the three persons in the Godhead, among those who approved the decisions of the council of Nice. There is so little clearness and discrimination in these discussions that they seem to rend the one God into *three* Gods. Moreover, those idle fictions, which a regard for the Platonic philosophy and for the prevailing opinions of the day had induced most theologians to embrace, even before the times of *Constantine*, were now in various ways confirmed, extended, and embellished. Hence it is that we see on every side evident traces of excessive veneration for saints in heaven, of belief in a fire to purify souls on leaving the body, of partiality for priestly celibacy, the worship of images and relics, and for many other opinions which, in process of time, almost banished the true religion, or at least very much obscured and corrupted it.

§ 2. Genuine piety was gradually supplanted by a long train of superstitious observances, which were derived, partly from opinions inconsiderately embraced, partly from a preposterous disposition to adopt profane rites, and combine them with Christian worship, and partly from the natural predilection of mankind generally for a vain sort of ostentation in religion. At first, frequent pilgrimages were undertaken to Palestine, and to the tombs of the martyrs; as if *thence* men could bear away the radical principles of holiness, and certain hopes of salvation.¹ Next, from Palestine, and from places venerated for

¹ See Gregory Nyssen, *Oratio ad eos qui Hierosolymam adeunt*; Opp. iii. 568. Hieronymus, *Ep. xiii. ad Paulinum, de Institut. Monachi*; Opp. i. 66. Ja. Godefroi, *ad*

Codicem Theodos. vi. 65, &c. Peter Wesseling, *Diss. de caussis peregrinat. Hierosolymit.* prefixed to the *Itinerarium Burdigalense*; among the *Vetera Romanor. Itineraria*

sanctity, portions of dust or earth were brought, as most efficacious remedies against assaults of evil; and these were bought and sold everywhere at great prices.¹ Further, the public supplications, by which the pagans were accustomed to appease their gods, were borrowed from them, and were celebrated in many places with great pomp. To the temples, to water consecrated with certain forms, and to likenesses of holy men, the same efficacy was ascribed, and the same privileges assigned, as had been attributed to the pagan temples, statues, and lustrations, before the advent of *Christ*. Pictures were, indeed, as yet but rare, and statues not in use. It is, however, particularly shameful, but beyond all doubt, that honours paid to the martyrs were gradually assimilated, with no bad intention, unquestionably, yet with great injury to the Christian cause, to the worship which the pagans had in former times paid to their gods.² From these specimens, intelligent readers will easily conceive how much injury the church received from the peace and repose procured by *Constantine*, and from an indiscreet eagerness to allure the populace within her pale. But the plan of this work will not admit of long details respecting such discreditable courses.

§ 3. This ill-advised piety of the people opened a wide door for endless frauds to persons base and bold enough to seek dishonourable gain in the folly and ignorance of others. Rumours were artfully disseminated of prodigies and wonders seen in certain edifices and places (a trick before this time practised by the pagan priests), whereby the infatuated populace were drawn together, and the stupidity and ignorance of those who looked upon everything new and unusual as a miracle, were often wretchedly imposed upon.³ Graves of saints and martyrs were supposed to be where they were not;⁴ the list of saints was enriched with fictitious names, and even robbers were converted into martyrs.⁵ Some buried blood-stained bones in retired places, and then gave out that they had been informed in a dream, that the corpse of some friend of God was there interred.⁶ Many, especially of the monks, travelled through the different provinces, and not only shamelessly carried on a traffic in fictitious relics, but

p. 537.—[*Helena*, the mother of *Constantine the Great*, seems to have been the first who gave the signal for these religious journeys. At least, it is stated by *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 17, and by *Theodoret*, *H. E.* i. 18, that she was instructed by a dream to go to *Jerusalem*, and that she wished to find the grave of *Christ*; that she actually did find three crosses, with a superscription; that one of them instantly cured a dying woman, and was therefore concluded to be the cross of *Christ*. She gave a part of it to the city of *Jerusalem*; and sent the other part to the emperor, who incased it in his own statue, and regarded it as the *Palladium* of his new city; and that the people used to assemble around this statue with wax candles. See *J. Andr. Schmidt*, *Problem. de*

Crucis Dominicæ per Helenam Constantini Imp. matrem inventionem, Helmst. 1724. *Schl.*]

¹ *Augustine*, *de Civitate Dei*, l. xxii. c. 8, § 6, and many others.

² This is shown at length, by *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manichisme*, ii. 642, &c.

³ *Henry Dodwell's Dissertat.* ii. in *Irenæum*, § 56, p. 196, &c. *Jo. le Clerc*, in his *Appendix Augustiniana*, p. 492, 550, 575.

⁴ *Concilium Carthagin.* v. canon. 14. *Concilia*, i. 988, ed. *Harduin*.

⁵ *Sulpitius Severus*, *de Vita S. Martini*, cap. 8.

⁶ *Augustine*, *Sermo* 318, § 1. *Opp.* v. 886, ed. *Antwerp*.

also deceived the eyes of the multitude by inventing combats with evil spirits.¹ It would require a volume to detail the various impostures which were, for the most part, successfully practised by artful knaves, after genuine piety and religion were compelled to resign their dominion in great measure to superstition.

§ 4. Many laboured earnestly, few successfully, on the sacred volume. *Jerome*, a man of great industry, and not unskilful in the languages, made a new Latin translation of the sacred books; which was more lucid and considerably better than any of the numerous old Latin versions.² He also took much pains to set forth a more correct edition of the Greek version by the Seventy: and the same thing, we are told, was undertaken by *Eusebius*, *Athanasius*, and *Euthalius*.³ The expositors of Scripture form a long list: among whom the most distinguished are *Jerome*, *Hilary*, *Eusebius*, *Diodorus* of Tarsus, *Rufinus*, *Ephrem Syrus*, *Theodorus* of Heraclea, *Chrysostom*, *Athanasius*, and *Didymus*. Yet few of these have correctly discharged the duty of interpreters. *Rufinus*, indeed, *Theodorus* of Heraclea, *Diodorus*, and a few others, followed the literal sense of Scripture;⁴ the rest, after the example of *Origen* their guide, search for recondite meanings; and accommodate, or rather constrain, the half-understood language of the Bible to speak of sacred mysteries and a Christian life.⁵ *Augustine* and *Tychonius*

¹ See Ja. Godefroi, *ad Codicem Theodos.* iii. 172. *Augustine*, *de Opere Monachorum*, cap. 28, § 36, Opp. vi. 364. *Jerome*, *Epistola ad Rusticum*; Opp. i. 45.

² See Ja. Fran. Buddeus, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, ii. 1532, &c.—[That there were many Latin versions extant in the fourth century, is very clearly stated by *Augustine*, *de Doctrina Christiana*, ii. 11. Of these (as *Augustine* tells us, *loc. cit.*), one was called (*Italica*) the *Italic*. But it has become usual to apply this designation to every ancient Latin version, which was not amended by *Jerome*; and this has given occasion to many mistakes. See *Mosheim*, *de Rebus*, p. 225—229. *Jerome* mentions a version, which he calls (*Vulgata*) the *vulgar*, and which *Michaelis* takes to be that used at Rome in the days of *Jerome*. These translations, in diction, were neither classical nor tolerable; yet they may be of use to those who wish to become acquainted with the Latin language in its fullest extent. They contain an immense number of Hebraisms, or rather Syriasm; which leads to the conjecture, that their authors were in great measure Jews. These versions fell into great disorder, in which no two copies were alike; because different translations were in fact blended together, the words of one Evangelist were transferred into the narrative of another, and many glosses were in-

corporated into the text. This induced the Roman bishop *Damasus* to commit the improving of these ancient versions to *Jerome*, who undertook the business in the year 384. He erased the false and incorrect readings, and improved the translations, which came into his hands very faulty, uniformly guiding himself by the original text. The improved version of *Jerome* is, a few alterations excepted, that *Vulgate* which is held in so high estimation by the Roman Catholic church. The really new translation of the Bible by *Jerome*, was published from manuscripts by the Benedictine monks *Jo. Martianay* and *Ant. Pouget*, Paris, 1693, under the title *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi divina Bibliotheca, hactenus inedita*. Their *Prolegomena* are worth reading. See *Rich. Simon*, *Histoire Critique des Versions du Nouveau Test.* cap. 7—12, and *Michaelis*, *Introduction to the New Test.* Schl.]

³ *Jo. Frick*, *de Canone Novi Testamenti*, p. 180.

⁴ *Rich. Simon*, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiast.* par *M. du Pin*, i. 51, 90, 129, and iv. 335, &c. and *Histoire Critique des Principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Test.* cap. vi. &c. p. 88, &c.

⁵ See *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Carmen de se ipso*; in *Ja. Tollii Insignib. Itineris Italici*, p. 27, 57. He very much commends this method.

wished to establish rules for interpretation, but neither of them had ability to do it.¹

§ 5. The doctors who were distinguished for their learning, explained the sacred doctrines after the manner of *Origen* (on whom they all fixed their eye), in accordance with the principles of that philosophy which they learned in their youth at school, namely, the Platonic philosophy as corrected by *Origen*. Those who wish to get a full insight into this subject may examine *Gregory Nazianzen* among the Greeks, and *Augustine* among the Latins; who were regarded in the subsequent ages as the only patterns worthy of imitation, and may be fitly styled, next to *Origen*, the parents and supporters of philosophic or *scholastic* theology. They were both admirers of *Plato*, and held as certain all his decisions which were not absolutely repugnant to the truths of Christianity: and proceeding upon these as their first principles, they drew from them many and very subtle conclusions. There was, however, at the same time, another class, which daily increased in number, and which considered the knowledge of divine things as attainable, not by *reasoning*, but by *contemplation*, and by calling away the mind from converse with external objects to concentration in itself. These are commonly called *mystics*. That these abounded appears from several considerations, and particularly from the numerous herds of monks who were spread nearly all over the Christian world; and from the works of *Dionysius*, that *coryphæus* of the mystics, which were produced, it seems, in this age, and by some one of this class.

§ 6. Among the writings of this age, in which the doctrines of Christianity are stated and explained, the first place is justly due to the catechetical discourses of *Cyril*, bishop of Jerusalem. For those who would persuade us that these discourses were the production of a subsequent age, are so blinded by zeal for a party as not to discern the truth.² Many would also here place the *Divine Institutions* of *Lactantius*; but improperly, because this work aims rather at confuting those who still adhered to polytheism, than unfolding the truths taught by inspiration. The *System of Doctrine* addressed to the clergy and laity, which is ascribed to *Athanasius*, appears to have been the production of a later age.³ There are, however, in the works of *Athanasius*, *Chrysostom*, the *Gregories*, and others, as now extant, many passages from which we may learn how the best-informed men of this age handled the leading topics of the Christian religion. On the *Trinity*, in particular, we have the twelve books of *Hilary* of Poitiers. The *Ancoratus* of *Epiphanius* explains the doctrine concerning *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*. On *baptism*, we have the work of *Pacianus*, addressed to the catechumens; and a work of *Chrysostom*, on the same subject, in two books. The works of *Jerome*,

¹ Augustine, in his six books *de Doctrina Christiana*; Tichonius, in his *Seven Rules of Interpretation*; which are extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum maxima*, vi. 48.

² See Jo. Fecht, *Comment. de Origène*

Missarum in honorem Sanctorum, p. 404, &c.

³ [It is not so much a treatise on dogmatics, as one on morals, containing rules of life, especially for monks. *Schl.*]

Augustine, and others, which were designed to impart correct views on religious subjects, and to confute the opposers of the truth, are here omitted.

§ 7. From the disputes with those who were regarded as opposed to divine truth, the ancient simplicity had nearly taken its flight; and in place of it, dialectical subtleties and quibbles, invectives, and other disingenuous artifices had succeeded, more becoming the patrons than the opposers of error. Censures of this habit, by men of eminence, are still extant.¹ I pass in silence those rhetorical figures and flourishes by which many endeavoured to parry the weapons of their adversaries, and to involve in obscurity the question under discussion; likewise the inclination to excite odium against their antagonists, so common to many; and the disregard of proper arrangement and of perspicuity, and other habits which were no better, in their discussions. Yet so far were some writers of this century from disguising these faults, that they rather claimed praise for them. It must be owned, however, that their antagonists made use of the same weapons.

§ 8. With the ancient form of discussion, new *sources of argument* were in this age combined. For the truth of doctrines was proved by the number of martyrs who had believed so, by prodigies, and by the confessions of devils, that is, of persons in whose bodies some demon was supposed to reside. The discerning cannot but see, that all proofs drawn from such sources are very fallacious, and very convenient for dishonest men who would practise imposture. And I greatly fear, that most of those who at this time resorted to such proofs, though they might be grave and eminent men, may be justly charged with a dangerous propensity to use deception. *Ambrose*, in controversy with the Arians, brings forward persons possessed with devils, who are constrained, when the relics of *Gervasius* and *Prothasius* are produced, to cry out, that the doctrine of the Nicene council, concerning three persons in the Godhead, is true and divine, and the doctrine of the Arians false and pernicious. This testimony of the prince of darkness *Ambrose* regards as proof altogether unexceptionable. But the Arians openly ridiculed the prodigy, and maintained that *Ambrose* had bribed these infernals to bear testimony in his favour.² And many, I am aware, will be more inclined to believe the Arians than to give credit to *Ambrose*, notwithstanding that he is enrolled among saints, and they among heretics.³

§ 9. Besides *Apollinaris*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Cyril* of Alexandria, and others who confuted the emperor *Julian*, the adherents to idolatry were vigorously and successfully encountered by *Lactantius*, by *Athanasius*, by *Julius Firmicus Maternus*, by the younger

¹ Methodius, cited by Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 64. Opp. i. 563; Gregory Nazianzen, in many places; and others.

² Ambrose, *Epist.* xxii. p. 878, &c. Paulinus, *de Vita Ambrosii*, p. 81.

³ See Jo. le Clerc, *Appendix Augusti-*

niana, p. 375. More examples of this kind might be mentioned. See Gregory Nyssen, *de Vita Gregorii Cæsariensis*, Opp. ii. 977, 978; Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, ii. 38, p. 261.

Apollinaris, whose books against *Porphyry* are unhappily lost, by *Augustine* in his twenty-two books on the City of God, and in his three lost books against the pagans, and above all, by *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, in his *Evangelical Preparation*, and in his book against *Hierocles*. Attempts to convert the Jews were made by *Eusebius* of Emesa, by *Diodorus* of Tarsus, and by *Chrysostom* in his six books still extant. Against all the heresies, *Ephræm* Syrus,¹ *James* of Nisibis, *Didymus*, and *Audentius*, took up the pen. So did *Epiphanius*, in his extensive work on the heresies, which he denominated *Panarium*; and *Gregory* Nazianzen, more concisely, in his *Oration on the Faith*. The short works of *Augustine* and *Philastrius* rather enumerate the heresies than confute them.

§ 10. The state of moral or practical theology would have been very flourishing if the progress of any branch of knowledge could be measured by the number of the writers on it; for very many laboured to perfect and inculcate practical religion. Among the orientals, the efforts of *James* of Nisibis, or as some say, of Saruga,² and *Ephræm* Syrus, were very considerable in this department. What we meet with respecting the life and duties of a Christian, in the writings of *Basil* the Great, *Gregory* Nyssen, *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, and others, can neither be altogether approved, nor wholly condemned. Many give the preference to the three books of *Ambrose*, on the duties of ministers of the church, which are written after the manner of *Cicero*: and they certainly deserve commendation, so far as the writer's intentions and beautiful sentiments are concerned; but they contain many things which may justly be censured. Perhaps, before all others who wrote on practical piety, the preference is due to *Macarius*, the Egyptian monk;³ from whom, after deducting some superstitious notions, and what savours too much of Origenism, we may collect a shining picture of holiness.

§ 11. Nearly all the writers in this department are defective in the following respects. First, they pay no regard to method and just arrangement, in respect to the subject which they have undertaken to explain. They rarely define, never divide, but pour out whatever comes uppermost in their minds, which, though pious, are not very clear and correct. In the next place, they either neglect to trace the duties of men back to their sources, and their first principles, or they derive them from precepts and doctrines which are either manifestly false, or not fully ascertained. Lastly, when they come to the proof of their positions, most of them do not resort to the law of God for arguments to enforce duty and put down vice, but to airy fancies, to frigid allegories, and fine-spun subtleties, better suited to tickle the imagination than to awaken and overpower the conscience.

¹ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, i. 118, 125, &c. From his extracts it appears that Ephræm, though a pious man, was not a dexterous polemic.

² Jos. Sim. Asseman, in his *Biblioth. Orient.* &c. i. 17, thinks that the writings

ascribed to James of Nisibis, should rather be ascribed to a person of Saruga. But in his addenda, p. 558, he corrects this opinion in some measure.

³ See the *Acta Sanctorum*, Januarii, i. 1005.

§ 12. But these works are far more tolerable than that combination of the precepts of *Christ* with those of *Plato*, or rather with those of the Alexandrian philosophers—the followers of *Ammonius Saccus*; and that twofold kind of piety, the one more perfect and complete, and the other less so, which almost all now embraced. How very much these views of religion had gained ground, may appear from the fact, that those who had long cried up a sort of recondite and mysterious knowledge of divine things, wholly different from the common knowledge of the vulgar, were bold enough in this century to attempt to perfect their views, and to reduce them to a regular system. It is most probable that among the Greeks of this century (though some think him earlier, and some later) that fanatic lived, who assumed the name and character of *Dionysius the Areopagite*, *St. Paul's* disciple; and who under the cover of this shield gave laws to such as wished to withdraw themselves by contemplation from the world, and bring back to its original, the soul that came from God.¹ As soon as the writings of this man passed into the hands of the Greeks and Syrians, and especially into those of the solitaries and monks, it is not easy to describe how much darkness spread over the minds of many, and what an increase of numbers there was among those who preached up, that converse with God is to be sought by mortifying the senses, withdrawing the thoughts from all external objects, subduing the body with hunger and hardships, and fixing the attention on God and eternal things, in a kind of holy indolence.

§ 13. The truth of these remarks is evinced by that vast multitude of monks and sacred virgins who spread themselves, as soon as peace was given to the Christians, with astonishing rapidity, over the whole Christian world. Many persons among Christians, of this description, had long lived by themselves in the deserts of Egypt. *Antony* was the first, who in the year 305 collected them into an associated community in Egypt, and regulated their mode of living by fixed rules.² His disciple *Hilarion*, the next year, undertook the same thing in Palestine and Syria. About the same time, *Aones* or *Eugenius*, with

¹ Those who have written concerning this deceiver, are enumerated by Jo. Fran. Buddens, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, l. ii. ch. iv. § 8, p. 602, &c. See also Jo. Launoi, *Judicium de Scriptis Dionysii*; Opp. t. ii. pt. i. p. 562. Matur. Veiss de la Croze, in his *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie*, p. 10, &c. endeavours to prove that Synesius, a celebrated philosopher and bishop in Egypt, of the fifth century, was the author of the Dionysian writings; and that he designed by them to support the doctrine of but one nature in Christ. But he uses feeble arguments. Nor are those more substantial, by which Jo. Phil. Baratier (in his Diss. subjoined to his book *De Successione Romanor. Episcop.* p. 286) endeavours to prove that Dionysius of Alexandria was

the true author of those writings.—[The real author of these works is wholly unknown. That he was not Dionysius the Areopagite, is certain. That he was a Greek who lived some time in the fourth century, is generally admitted; though some place him a century later. That he was Apollinaris senior, or junior, of Laodicea, several have laboured to prove, but without much success. See Cave, *Historia Litterar.* Daillé, *de Scriptis Dionysii Areopagite*, Genævæ, 1666, 4to. Bishop Pearson, *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, pt. i. c. 10. Tr.—See also note, cent. iii. p. ii. c. 3, § 11. Ed.]

² Antony and his regulations are treated of in the *Acta Sanctor.* addiem 17 Januarii, ii. 107.

his associates *Gadilanas* and *Azyzus*, introduced this mode of life into Mesopotamia and the neighbouring countries.¹ These were imitated by many others with so much success, that in a short time all the East swarmed with persons who, abandoning the occupations and conveniences of life, and all intercourse with society, pined away amidst various hardships, hunger, and sufferings, in order to maintain a more close communion with God and the angels. The Christian church would have remained free from these numerous tormentors of their own minds and bodies, had it not given admittance to that great and high-sounding doctrine of the ancient philosophy, which made happiness and heavenly converse depend upon such a separation of soul from body as required enervation of the frame.

§ 14. This austere discipline passed from the East into the West, and first into Italy and the adjacent islands, though it is uncertain who conveyed it thither.² Afterwards, *St. Martin*, the celebrated bishop of Tours, erected some monasteries in Gaul, and by his example and his discourses produced such eagerness to embrace a monastic life, that two thousand monks are said to have assembled together at his funeral.³ From thence this way of life gradually extended over the other countries of Europe. Those, however, who would acquaint themselves with these matters, should know that there has always been a wide difference between the monks of the West and those of the East; and that the former could never be bound by the hard and severe rules to which the latter submitted. For our part of the world is not so filled with persons who are by nature sour, morose, delirious, and fanatical, as those oriental regions are; nor will our bodies endure that abstemiousness in regard to nourishment which those will which were born under a dry and burning atmosphere. It was, therefore, rather the name and the shadow of that solitary life which *Antony* and others instituted in the East, than the thing itself, which was brought into the countries of Europe.⁴

¹ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 48, &c.

² The majority follow Baronius, maintaining that it was St. Athanasius who, about the year 340, transplanted the monastic institution from Egypt into Italy, and erected the first monastery at Rome. See Mabillon, *Præfatio ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. i. 9*, &c. But Lud. Ant. Muratori opposes this opinion, and contends that the first European monastery was built at Milan. *Antiq. Italicar. medii ævi*, v. 364. Again, Just. Fontaninus, in his *Historia Litterar. Aquileiens.* p. 155, &c. maintains that the first society of monks was collected at Aquileia. None of these writers adduce unexceptionable proof. The first convent of nuns was erected at Verona, near the close of this century, and by Zeno, the bishop of Verona, if we may give credit to the bro-

thers Ballerini, in their *Diss. II. ad Zenonem Veronens.* p. 116, &c.

³ See Sulpitius Severus, *de Vita Martini*, cap. x. p. 17, ed. Veron. where the mode of life adopted by these Martinian monks is particularly described. See also the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. i. pt. ii. p. 42, and others.

⁴ This difference between the oriental and the occidental monks, as to their mode of living, and the cause of it, are pleasantly noticed by Sulpitius Severus, Dial. i. *de Vita Martini*, c. 2, p. 65, ed. Verona. One of the interlocutors having described the dry and sparing diet of the Egyptian monks, Sulpitius turned to his Gallic friend, and said: 'How would you like a bunch of herbs and half a loaf, as a dinner for five men?' He, reddening a little on being so rallied, replied: 'You are at your old practice, Sul-

§ 15. These monks¹ were not all of the same kind; for first, they were divided into *Cœnobites* and *Eremites*. The former lived and ate together in the same house, and were associated under a leader and head, whom they called *Father*, or, in the Egyptian tongue, *Abbot*.² The latter, the *Eremites*, led a cheerless, solitary life, in certain parts of the country, dwelling in hovels among the wild beasts.³ Still more austere than the *Eremites*, were those who were called *Anchorites*. These lived in desert places, with no kind of shelter; fed on roots and plants; and had no fixed residence, but lodged wherever night overtook them, so that visitors might not know where to find them.⁴ The last class of monks were the *Vagrants*, called by the Egyptians *Sarabaitæ*, who roamed about the provinces, and from city to city, and got their living without labour, by pretended miracles, by trafficking in relics, and by other impostures.⁵

pitius, for you neglect no opportunity that occurs to tax us [Gallic monks] with voracity. But it is cruel in you to require us Gauls to live in the manner of angels. But let that Cyrenian [monk] content himself with such a dinner, since it is his necessity or nature to go hungry. We, as I have often told you, are Gauls.' In the same dialogue, cap. 4, p. 69, 70, he taxes Jerome with accusing the monks of edacity, and goes on to say: 'I perceive that he refers rather to the oriental monks than to the occidental: for edacity in the Greeks [and orientals] is gluttony; in the Gauls it is nature.' Immediately, therefore, on the introduction of the monastic institution into Europe, the occidental monks differed widely from the oriental in their customs and mode of living, and were taxed by them with voraciousness and gluttony.

¹ [The word *monk* (μοναχὸς, from μονάζειν, to live alone) first occurs in the fourth century, and is kindred with *ascetic* (ἀσκητής, from ἀσκέω, to practise, to exercise). The name *ascetic* denotes a Christian who devotes himself to severe religious exercises, and particularly to abstinence and fasting. Such ascetics have always existed among Christians; but these were not always monks. The word *ascetic* is a generic term; the word *monk* denotes a species under that genus. This is conceded by the Catholics, Valesius (notes on Euseb. *H. E.* xi. 17, and *de Martyr. Palest.* c. 11), and by Pagi, *Critica in Annal. Baronii*, ad ann. 62, § 4, t. i. p. 48.—The males among the monks were called *Nonni*, and the females *Nonnæ*. See Jerome, *Ep.* 18, ad Eustoch. Opp. tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 34, ed. Martianay. Erasmus derives the term *nonnus* from the Egyptian language; Gerh. Jo. Vossius derives it from the Hebrew נֶזֶם, a son; **de Vitiis Sermonis*, l. i. c. 6, p. 9, l. i. c. 13; *de Orig. Idolol.* l. i. c. 24. Schl.]

² [The *cœnobites* derived their name

from [κοινῶσιον] *cœnobium* (κοινὸς βίος), a habitation in which several monks lived together. The ancients discriminated between a *cœnobium* and a *monastery*. The latter was the residence of proper and solitary monks; the former, of associated monks, who lived together in a society. The habitation of a single, solitary monk, might be called a *monastery*, but not a *cœnobium*. See Cassianus, *Collat.* xviii. c. 10, Opp. p. 525, and compare Jerome, *Ep.* 95, ad Rusticum monachum; Opp. tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 775, and Gregory Naz. *Orat.* xxi. Opp. i. 384.—The nuns also had their presidents, who were called *Mothers*. See Jerome, *Ep.* 20, Opp. tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 51. See also Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiast.* vol. iii. p. 63. Schl.]

³ [The terms *monks*, *eremites*, and *anchorites*, or *anachorites*, were, at first, all used as synonymous; and were applied indiscriminately to those Egyptian ascetics who ἀναχώρησαν retired from the world, and lived solitary, μοναχοί (from μόνος, alone), in the wilderness, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, for the sake of practising (ἀσκεῖν) religious exercises without interruption. The words *ascetic* and *monk* continued to be generic, and were applied to all who devoted themselves to a religious life, and subjected themselves to strict rules of living. The other terms acquired more appropriate significations, when the monks became distributed into various classes or sorts. Tr.]

⁴ See Sulpitius Severus, *Dial. i. de Vita Martini*, c. ix. p. 80, &c. ed. Verona. [When several anchorites lived in the same wilderness, only a little separated from each other, they were collectively called a *Laura*. See Evagrius, *H. E.* i. 21, and Valesius, note on this passage. See also Walch's *Hist. Eccles. Nov. Test.* p. 1670. Schl.]

⁵ [Concerning the *Sarabaites*, see Jo. Cassianus, *Collat.* xviii. c. 7, Opp. p. 731, &c. and the notes of Gazæus there. Tr.—

Among the *Cænobites*, many were vicious and profligate; but not so many as among the *Sarabaites*, most of whom were men without integrity or worth of any kind. The *Eremites* were generally delirious fanatics, whose understandings were at fault.¹ All of them originally were no members of the clerical order, but *laymen* under the care and protection of the bishops. But many of them were admitted into the rank of *clergymen*, even by the command of the emperors; and so great was their reputation for sanctity, that bishops were often chosen from among them.²

§ 16. To these defects in the moral system of the age must be added two principal errors now almost publicly adopted, and from which afterwards immense evils resulted. The first was, that to *deceive and lie is a virtue*, when religion can be promoted by it. The other was, that *errors in religion*, when maintained after proper admonition, ought to be visited with *penalties and punishments*. The first of these principles had been embraced in the preceding centuries, and it is almost incredible what a mass of the most insipid fables, and what a host of pious falsehoods have through all ages grown out of it, to the great detriment of true religion. If some inquisitive person were to examine the conduct and the writings of the greatest and most pious teachers of this century, I fear that he would find almost all of them infected with this leprosy. I cannot except *Ambrose*, nor *Hilary*, nor *Augustine*, nor *Gregory Nazianzen*, nor *Jerome*. And perhaps it was this same fault that led *Sulpitius Severus*, who was in other respects no incompetent historian, to ascribe so many miracles to *St. Martin*. The other principle, from the very time when *Constantine* gave peace and security to the Christians, was approved by many; in the conflicts with the Priscillianists and Donatists, it was corroborated by examples, and unequivocally sanctioned by the authority of *Augustine*, and transmitted down to succeeding ages.

§ 17. If we look at the lives and morals of Christians, we shall find, as heretofore, that good were commingled with bad; yet the number of the bad began gradually to increase, so that men truly pious and godly were more rarely seen. When there was nothing any longer to be feared from enemies without; when the character of most bishops was tarnished with arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animosity, resentments, and other defects; when the lower clergy neglected their proper duties, and were more attentive to idle controversies than to the promotion of piety and the instruction of the people; when vast numbers were induced, not by a rational conviction, but by the fear of punishment, and the hope of worldly advantage, to enrol themselves as Christians; how can it surprise us, that on all sides the vicious appeared a host, and the pious a little band almost over-

Their name appears derivable from the Hebrew סָרַב, *Sarab*, refractory. *S.*]

¹ On the vices of the monks of this century, see *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i. *de Vita Martini*, cap. viii. p. 69, 70, cap. xxi. p. 88, where he chastises in particular the pride of those who coveted the honours of

clergymen. Dial. ii. c. viii. p. 112. Dial. iii. c. xv. p. 144, 145, also the *Consultatio Apollonii et Zachari*, published by Lu. D'Achery, in *Spicileg.* tom. i. l. iii. c. 3, p. 35, &c.

² See Ja. Godefroi, on the *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi. pt. i. p. 76, 106, ed. Ritter.

powered by them? Against the flagitious, and those guilty of heinous offences, the same rules for penance were prescribed as before the reign of Constantine. But as the times continually waxed worse, the more honourable and powerful could sin with impunity, and only the poor and the unfortunate felt the severity of the laws.

§ 18. This century was fruitful in controversies among Christians; for, as is common with mankind, external peace made room for internal discords and contentions. We shall here mention the more considerable ones which did not give rise to obstinate heresies. In Egypt, soon after the century began, or about the year 306, commenced the long-continued schism, which from the author of it was called the *Meletian* controversy. *Peter*, the bishop of Alexandria, deposed *Meletius*, the bishop of Lycopolis in Thebais. The cause is involved in uncertainty. The friends of *Peter* represent *Meletius* as one who had sacrificed to the gods, and had committed other crimes.¹ Others report him to have been guilty of no other offence than that of excessive severity against the lapsed.² *Meletius* disregarded the sentence of *Peter*, and not only continued to exercise the functions of his office, but also assumed to himself the power of consecrating presbyters; a right which, according to established usage in Egypt, belonged exclusively to the bishop of Alexandria. The partisans of this serious and eloquent man were numerous; and at length not a few of the monks espoused his cause. The Nicene council attempted in vain to heal this breach.³ The *Meletians*, on the contrary, whose chief aim was to oppose the authority claimed by the bishop of Alexandria, afterwards joined themselves to his great enemies, namely, the Arians.⁴ Thus a contest which at first related only to the limits of the Alexandrian bishop's powers became, through the influence of heated passions, a controversy respecting an article of faith. The Meletian party was still existing in the fifth century.⁵

¹ Athanasius, *Apologia secunda*; Opp. i. 777, &c.

² Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxviii. Opp. i. 716, &c. See Dion. Petavius, note on *Epiphanius*. ii. 274; and Sam. Basnage, *Exercitatio de Rebus Sacris contra Baronium*, p. 305, &c.

³ [See the epistle of the council, note on cent. iv. p. ii. c. 5, § 12. The charge of Athanasius against Meletius of sacrificing to idols seems to be disproved by this epistle. *Ed.*—The sixth canon of this council refers also to this subject. 'The existing laws in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, shall hereafter be observed; that the bishop of Alexandria shall have the oversight of all these—and if any one shall be made a bishop, without the previous consent of the metropolitan, he shall not hold the office.' See Mansi, *Concilia*, ii. 670; and Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, iv. 385, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ [See Walch's *Ketzerhistorie*, iv. 393, &c. *Schl.*]

⁵ Socrates, *H. E.* i. 6. Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 8.

[Some reject altogether the account of Epiphanius, regarding that of Athanasius as more worthy of credit. This is the prevailing opinion in the Roman Catholic church. Others prefer the account of Epiphanius, for the following reasons:—1. Epiphanius was prepossessed in favour of neither party. He speaks respectfully of the bishops opposed to Meletius, and he censures the Meletians with caution. 2. On the contrary, Athanasius was a strenuous foe to the Meletians, and everywhere shows his bitter hatred of them. 3. Yet he mentions the crime of Meletius but once, and then very concisely. The subsequent writers, who were more free from the heat of passion, do not follow him exactly. Only Socrates coincides with him. Theodoret omits the circumstance of Meletius's fall. Sozomen is wholly silent about it. Yet it is not probable that these writers, who were by no means partial to the Meletians, would have so deviated from Athanasius, if they had held his statement to be incontrovertible.

§ 19. Not long after Meletius, one *Eustathius* excited great commotions in Armenia, Pontus, and the neighbouring countries, and

4. Epiphanius is not inclined to say favourable things of other sectarians without good reason; and the evil which Athanasius had said of Meletius could not, probably, have been unknown to him. 5. The statement of Epiphanius has too much self-consistency for a fabrication. 6. What Epiphanius states of the views of bishop Peter, in regard to admitting the lapsed to communion, agrees with the fourteenth and fifteenth canons of this bishop; on which, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* viii. 411, and Tillemont, v. 450, &c. 7. It is incomprehensible that the Nicene fathers should have treated Meletius so indulgently, if they regarded the accusation of Athanasius as well founded. 8. As the Meletians were so strict in their intercourse with the lapsed, it is inconceivable that they could receive for their leader any person who had been guilty of a fall of the grossest kind. There are others who are undecided, and not established in their judgment. Sam. Basnage, in his *Exercit. Antibar.* referred to above in note ², declares the accusation of Athanasius, in regard to the idolatrous sacrifice, to be false; and in his *Annales Politico-ecclesiast.* ii. 608, &c. he rejects the account of Epiphanius. E. Baumgarten, in his *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* ii. 681, gives the preference to the statement of Athanasius; but in his *Geschichte der Religionspartheien*, p. 506, he follows Epiphanius exclusively. Even Mosheim, in the first edition of his *Institutes of Christian Church History*, p. 253, says: 'Notwithstanding the objections of Petavius, perhaps the statement of Epiphanius is the most correct.' But in the new edition, this remark is omitted. Also in his lectures, during his last years, he expressed himself dubiously, without declaring for either party. The most full and soundly critical examination of the Meletian controversy, is that of Walch, *Hist. Ketzer.* iv. 355—410; He also remarks, from Tillemont, v. 455, that one Meletius of Syria caused a schism, which, in its consequences, was more important than the preceding; and that Erasmus and Prateolus confound the two. After the council of Nice, Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, very strenuously opposed the progress of Arian doctrines, and was therefore deprived of his office; and another was elected in his place who was more favourable to the Arians; and after him succeeded others, all holding Arian sentiments. The last of these was Eudoxius, who was removed to Constantinople on the deposition of Macedonius, bishop of that city (A.D. 360). Meletius, of Syria, was now chosen bishop of Antioch by a council. He had before

been bishop of Sebastia, and the heads of the Arian party supposed him to hold the Arian sentiments. He at least held communion with Arians, and had by his virtuous life obtained a high reputation. At first Meletius concealed his sentiments, and in his public discourses treated only on practical subjects. But as one part of his hearers were orthodox, and the other part Arians, he did not long leave them in uncertainty, but acknowledged to them his conviction of the correctness of the Nicene faith. This acknowledgment was the source of much suffering to Meletius. The Arians resented it very highly, that he should disappoint their expectations; and as he would not retract, they deprived him of his office, A.D. 361, by the aid of the emperor Constantius, and banished him. Meletius now left Antioch and went to his native city Melitene. In his place, Euzoius, one of the oldest friends of Arius, was appointed. But the orthodox, who would not acknowledge him as a bishop, now wholly ceased to worship with the Arians, which they had done up to this time. Thus there were now three parties at Antioch. The Arians, who acknowledged Euzoius for their bishop; the Eustathians, who ever since the deposition of Eustathius (A.D. 327), had ceased to worship with the Arians, and held their separate meetings without making disturbance; and the Meletians, who were the majority. The Meletians were willing to unite with the Eustathians, on condition that they would look upon Meletius as themselves did. But the Eustathians refused to do so, and would not acknowledge the Meletians for brethren, because they considered both them and their bishop as not pure enough from the Arian infection. Athanasius, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer attempted to reconcile these divisions. Lucifer (A.D. 362) consecrated a new bishop of Antioch; whom, however, the Eustathians only would receive. Meletius now came back to Antioch; and thus there were two bishops of Antioch, Paulinus (the Eustathian bishop) and Meletius; and the difficulties were increased, rather than settled, by the procedure of Lucifer. The foreign bishops took part in this controversy. Athanasius looked on Paulinus as the most orthodox, and therefore he and the greater part of the West took the side of Paulinus. The eastern bishops were on the side of Meletius; who was exiled by the emperor Valens, but returned after that emperor's death, and suddenly died (A.D. 381). The Greek and the Latin churches enrolled him among the saints after his death. The death of Meletius

was therefore condemned in the council of *Gangra*, which was held not long after the Nicene council. Whether this man was *Eustathius* the bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, the Coryphæus of the semi-Arians, or whether the ancients confounded two persons of the same name, is debated with about equal weight of argument on both sides.¹ The founder of the Eustathian sect is charged, not so much with unsoundness in the faith, as with ill-advised piety. For he is said not only to have prohibited marriage, eating flesh, love-feasts, and the like, but also to have recommended divorce to married persons, and to have granted to children and servants the liberty of violating the commands of their parents and masters, under pretext of religion.²

§ 20. *Lucifer*, bishop of *Cagliari* in Sardinia, a man of decision, sternness, and vigour, who was driven into exile by the emperor *Constantius*, for defending the Nicene doctrine of three persons in one God, first separated from *Eusebius*, bishop of Vercelli, in the year 363, because the latter was displeased at his consecration of *Paulinus* to

did not restore peace at Antioch. The Meletians, instead of acknowledging *Paulinus*, elected *Flavianus*, an orthodox and irreproachable character, for a successor to *Meletius*. *Flavianus* was supported by the bishops of Syria, Palestine, Phœnicia, Capadocia, Galatia, the lesser Asia, and Thrace; *Paulinus* by the bishops of Rome and Italy, and of Egypt and Arabia. *Paulinus* died in 389, but consecrated over his little party, before his death, one *Evagrius* as his successor. Soon after (A.D. 393) *Evagrius* died; but the disunion still continued. Finally, through the prudence and the peace-making temper of *Chrysostom*, peace and ecclesiastical communion were restored. *Flavianus* was acknowledged by the foreign bishops as the bishop of Antioch. Yet there remained a little handful of Eustathians, who did not unite with the general church till *Flavianus* was succeeded by other bishops. See *Walch*, *Ketzerhistorie*, iv. 410—502. *Schl.*]

¹ See *Sam. Basnage*, *Annales Politico-ecclesiast.* ii. 840, &c.

² *Socrates*, *H. E.* ii. 43. *Sozomen*, *H. E.* iii. 14, iv. 24. *Epiphanius*, *Heres.* lxvi. p. 910. *Philostorgius*, *H. E.* iii. 16. *Wolff*, *Gundling*, *Notæ ad Concilium Gangrense*, p. 9, &c.—[*Walch*, in his *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 536—577, has treated, circumstantially and solidly, concerning the Eustathians. See also his *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 216, &c. The chief sources for a history of the Eustathians, are the documents of the council of *Gangra*, consisting of a synodical epistle, and twenty canons. From these both *Socrates* and *Sozomen* derived their information. The author of the *Life of St. Basil*, prefixed to the third vol. of the works of *Basil*, maintains (ch. v. § 4, &c.) that the founder of this party was not Eu-

stathius, but rather *Aërius*; and also that the persons with whom the council of *Gangra* had to do, should not be called Eustathians, but *Aërians*. But the arguments are not so powerful as to compel a reflecting reader to abandon the common opinion. Whether the bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, who is so famous in the history of the Arian heresy, and who had some connexion with *Aërius*, or another Eustathius, was the origin of this controversy, cannot be determined with certainty. Yet the arguments for the first supposition seem to preponderate. This Eustathius was a pupil of *Aërius*, and a lover of monkery. Many different councils passed their judgment on him, some putting him down, and others regarding him as a valuable man. He has been accused of instability in his belief; but he seems properly to have been a semi-Arian. His character is described to us by some impartial writers, as being very commendable. The synodical epistle of the council of *Gangra* is addressed to the bishops of Armenia, and censures various faults, which for the most part relate to monkish usages: and the canons enjoin the opposite of the new regulations. The Eustathians condemned matrimony, because they maintained that a married lady, though pious, could not be saved, if she continued to cohabit with her husband. They forbade eating flesh, or receiving the holy supper from a married priest, on pain of forfeiting salvation. They contemned the buildings erected for public worship, and held their meetings in private. They allowed a woman to forsake her husband, parents their children, and children their parents, on pretence of devoting themselves to a stricter mode of life, &c. *Schl.*]

preside over the church of Antioch; and afterwards separated himself from the communion of the whole church, because it had decreed that absolution might be granted to those bishops who under *Constantius* had deserted to the Arians.¹ At least this is certain, that the little company of his followers, or the *Luciferians*, would have no intercourse with the bishops who had joined themselves to the Arian sect, nor with those who had pardoned these bishops after confessing their fault; and thus they renounced the whole church.² They are likewise reported to have held erroneous sentiments respecting the human soul, viewing it as generated from the bodies of the parents, or as transfused by the parents into the children.³

§ 21. About the same time, or not much after, *Aërius*, a presbyter, monk, and semi-Arian, rent Armenia, Pontus, and Cappadocia, by opinions wide of those commonly received, and thus founded a sect. First, he maintained that, by divine appointment,⁴ there was no difference between bishops and presbyters. Yet it is not very clear, how far he carried this opinion; though it is certain, that it was very pleasing to many who were disgusted with the pride of the bishops of that age. In the next place, *Aërius* disapproved of prayers for the dead, the stated fasts, the celebration of Easter, and other things, which most persons regarded as the very soul of religion.⁵

¹ Rufinus, *H. E.* i. 30. Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 9. See also Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vii. 521, ed. Paris.—[Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 338—377, enables us to enlarge the account given by Mosheim. When the orthodox party under Constantius, after the adverse result of the council of Arles, found themselves in great danger, and were deliberating about requesting the emperor to summon a new council, Lucifer proceeded to Rome, and being constituted envoy of pope Liberius, repaired to the imperial court in Gaul, and obtained of the emperor the council of Milan; by which, however, the emperor intended to further his own purposes. And as Lucifer was one of those who in that council zealously espoused the cause of the orthodox, he fell under the emperor's displeasure, and was sent among others into banishment. When the death of the emperor left him at liberty to return from exile, he became involved in the Meletian controversy at Antioch, and this occasioned his falling out with Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli. For he led on and consecrated the aged Paulinus, bishop, which Eusebius greatly disapproved; because, according to the decrees of the council held at Alexandria by Athanasius, he with Lucifer was commissioned to heal the division at Antioch, which was now widened still more by the unwise step of Lucifer. The same council had also decreed, that the Arian bishops, after acceding to the Nicene creed, might be received into the church and remain in their offices. But the refusal of

Eusebius to approve of the proceedings of Lucifer at Antioch, and the mild regulations of the Alexandrian council respecting those whom he accounted apostate bishops, induced him to break off all communion with such as approved those regulations: and thence arose the schism which bears his name. After this separation he continued to exercise his functions at Cagliari for nine years, and died at an advanced age. *Schl.*—See, for account of his writings, Note, cent. iv. p. ii. c. 2, § 10. *Tr.*]

² See the *petition* addressed to Theodosius, by Marcellinus and Faustinus, two Luciferians, in the works of Ja. Sirmond, ii. 229, &c.

³ See Augustine, *de Hæres.* c. 81; and on that passage, Lamb. Danaus, p. 346. [This account is very uncertain; and Augustine himself does not state it as a matter of certainty. See Walch, l. c. p. 368. *Schl.*]

⁴ *Jure divino.*

⁵ Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxv. p. 905, &c. Augustine, *de Hæres.* c. 53, and some others. [The last is not a witness of much weight. He had no acquaintance with the Aërians, but took one part of his statement from Epiphanius (*ubi supra*), and the other from Philastrius, *de Hæres.* c. 72, p. 140. Epiphanius had it in his power to get, and did get, better information respecting the oriental controversies, than Philastrius could. The latter speaks of Aërius, as one unknown to him; the former, as one whose history he well knew, and who was then alive. Epiphanius knew the Encratites very well, and

He seems to have aimed to reduce religion to its primitive simplicity: a design which, in itself considered, was laudable; though in the motives, and the mode of proceeding, there were perhaps some things censurable.

§ 22. There were other persons of this character in the fourth century who looked with disgust on the progress of superstition, and of errors respecting the true nature of religion, and who opposed the general current, but received as the only reward of their labour the brand of infamy. Eminent among them was *Jovinian*, an Italian monk, who taught first at Rome, and then at Milan, near the close of this century, and persuaded many, that all persons whatsoever, if they keep the vows they made to Christ in baptism, and live godly lives, have an equal title to the rewards of heaven; so that those who spent their lives in celibacy, or macerated their bodies by fasting, were no more acceptable to God than those who lived in wedlock, and nourished their bodies with moderation and sobriety. These sentiments were first condemned by the church of Rome, and then by *Ambrose*, in a council held at Milan, in the year 390.¹ The emperor

he distinguishes them from the Aërians; but Philastrius confounds them. Aërius was a native of Pontus, or of the lesser Armenia, an eloquent man, and a friend of the well-known semi-Arian Eustathius, afterwards bishop of Sebaste, with whom he lived at the same time among the monks. The elevation of Eustathius to the see of Sebaste, first awakened envy in Aërius, he having himself aspired after that promotion. To allay that feeling, Eustathius made his friend a presbyter, and committed to his care the superintendence of a house for the reception of strangers. But the good understanding between them was of short continuance. Aërius could be restrained by nothing from his restless conduct towards his bishop, whom he accused of avarice and misappropriation of the funds for the poor. At last, they came to a breach. Aërius abandoned his office and his hospital, and acquired many adherents, to whom none would show indulgence, as the disposition to persecute was then almost universal among the clergy. Aërius maintained, that in the times of the apostles there was no difference between a bishop and a presbyter; and this he solidly proved from passages in Paul. He was not disposed to abolish the human rights of bishops, but only to rescue the presbyters from episcopal oppression, in the exercise of their legitimate functions. He held the prayers and the alms of the living for the dead, to be useless and dangerous; and discarded the regular, prescribed Christian fasts on certain days. The festival of Easter he did not wholly discard, as it is commonly supposed, but only the ceremony of slaying a lamb at Easter, which according to ancient custom was practised by some

Christians. This appears from the argument by which he supported his opinion. For he says, 'Christians should keep no *Passover*, because Paul declares Christ, who was slain for us, to be *our Paschal Lamb*.' This reasoning would be insipid, if Aërius proposed by it to put down altogether the whole festival of Easter. Aërius was therefore in the right, and his opposers in the wrong. Only his obstinacy in pushing matters to a schism is blameable. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 321—338. *Schl.*]

¹ Jerome, in *Jovinianum*, Opp. tom. ii. Augustine, *de Hæres.* c. 82. Ambrose, *Ep.* vi. &c. [Jovinian lived at Rome, when he advanced the doctrines which were so strenuously opposed. Yet it is uncertain, whether Rome or Milan was his native place. He was not unlearned, and he lived a single life. To the preceding doctrines of Jovinian, the following may be added: that Mary ceased to be a virgin, by bringing forth Christ; which some denied;—that the degrees of future blessedness do not depend on the meritoriousness of our good works;—and that a truly converted Christian, so long as he is such, cannot sin wilfully, but will so resist the temptations of the devil, as not to be overcome by him. For these doctrines, Jovinian was accused by some Christians at Rome, before pope Siricius. A council was assembled by Siricius, by which Jovinian was condemned and excommunicated. He then retired, with his friends, to Milan. There they were condemned by a council which Ambrose assembled. By such persecution, the party was soon crushed. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 635—682. *Schl.*]

Honorius enacted penal laws against those holding such sentiments, and *Jovinian* he banished to the island *Boa*.¹ *Jovinian* published his opinions in a book, against which *St. Jerome*, in the following century, wrote a most bitter and abusive treatise, which is still extant.

§ 23. Of all the religious controversies,² those concerning *Origen* made the greatest noise and continued the longest. Though *Origen* had long been accused of many errors, yet hitherto most Christians had regarded his name with veneration. But now the Arians, cunningly looking on every side for support, maintained that this great man had been of their party. Some believed them, and therefore indulged the same hatred towards *Origen* as towards the Arians. Yet among the most eminent and best informed men there were those who resisted the charge and strove to vindicate the reputation of their master against these aspersions. In the number of them, *Eusebius*, bishop of *Cæsarea*, stood pre-eminent, from having written an *Apology for Origen*. And, I believe, this storm raised against the honour of a man, to whom the whole Christian world paid respect, would have soon subsided, if new commotions had not arisen, which proceeded from another source.

§ 24. All the monks, and especially those of Egypt, were enthusiastic admirers of *Origen*; and they spared no pains to disseminate everywhere the opinions which they imbibed from him. Yet they could not persuade all to believe that those opinions were sound and correct. Hence arose, at first, a concealed disagreement as to the reasonableness of the doctrines of *Origen*, which gradually increased till it burst into an open flame. Among many others, *John*, bishop of *Jerusalem*, was in favour of *Origen*; and as *Epiphanius* and *Jerome* were, from other causes, hostile to *John*, they endeavoured to excite odium against him on this ground. He defended himself in such a way as, at the same time, to protect the reputation of *Origen*; and thus he had the whole swarm of monks and innumerable others on his side. From this beginning followed those vehement contests respecting the doctrines of *Origen*, which pervaded both the East and the West. In the West they were fomented especially by *Rufinus*, a presbyter of *Aquileia*, who translated some of *Origen's* books into Latin, and showed, not obscurely, that he was pleased with the sentiments that those books contained.³ He therefore incurred the implacable wrath of *Jerome*. But at length, *Rufinus* being dead, and men of high reputation in the West opposing the progress of *Origenism*, both by their influence and their writings, these commotions seemed to subside in the West.

§ 25. In the East, far greater troubles came upon the church on

¹ *Codex Theodosianus*, iii. 218, vi. 193.— [This law is dated in 412. But according to *Jerome*, *Jovinian* must, in 406, have been dead some considerable time. The law therefore must have been aimed against a different person—and there appear in it no traces of the complaints brought against *Jovinian*—or the date must be erroneous,

as was conjectured by *Tillemont*, x. 229, 753. See *Walch*, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 664, &c. *Schl.*]

² [Among the orthodox. *Tr.*]

³ See especially *Just. Fontaninus*, *Historia Litteraria Aquileiens.* lib. iv. c. 3, &c. p. 177, &c. where he gives an elaborate history of *Rufinus*.

account of Origenism. *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria, who was for various reasons hostile to some of the monks of Scetis or Nitria, taxed them with their Origenism, and ordered them to throw away the books of *Origen*. The monks resisted his command; alleging, sometimes, that the objectionable passages in the writings of that holy man were interpolations of the heretics, and sometimes, that it was improper to condemn the whole together, on account of a few passages which might be justly censurable. *Theophilus*, therefore, having assembled a council at Alexandria in the year 399, which condemned the Origenists, with an armed force drove the monks from the mountain of Nitria. They fled first to Jerusalem, and thence removed to Scythopolis; but finding themselves insecure there likewise, they set sail for Constantinople, intending to lay their cause before the imperial court.¹ The remainder of their history belongs to the next century. But it is proper to remark, that those who are denominated *Origenists* in the writings of this age, were not all of one character. For this ambiguous term sometimes denotes merely a person friendly to *Origen*, who looked upon his books as corrupted, and did not defend the errors of which he was accused: but at other times it designates those persons who admitted that *Origen* taught all that he was charged with teaching, and who resolutely defended his opinions. Of this latter class were many of the monks.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES AND RITES.

§ 1, 2. Ceremonies multiplied — § 3. Form of public worship — § 4. Some parts of it changed — § 5. Festal days — § 6. Fasts — § 7. Administration of baptism — § 8. and of the Lord's supper.

§ 1. WHILE the good-will of the emperors aimed to advance the Christian religion, the indiscreet piety of the bishops obscured its true nature, and oppressed its energies, by the multiplication of rites and ceremonies. The observation of *Augustine* is well known, That the yoke once laid upon the Jews was more supportable than that laid on many Christians in his age.² For the Christian bishops introduced, with but slight alterations, into the Christian worship, those rites and institutions by which, formerly, the Greeks and Romans

¹ See Peter Dan. Huet, *Origeniana*, lib. ii. cap. 4, p. 196, &c. Ludov. Doucin, *Histoire de l'Origenisme*, liv. iii. p. 95, &c. Hieron. a Prato, Diss. vi. in Sulpitium Severum de *Monachis ob Origenis nomen ex Nitria totaque Aegypto pulsis*, 273, Veron. 1741, fol. These writers cite the ancient

authorities; but they make some mistakes. [The literary history of this controversy is given by the senior Walch, *Historia Eccles. N. T.* p. 1042, &c. *Schl.*]

² *Augustine*, *Epist.* 119, ad Januarium, according to the ancient division.

and others had manifested their piety and reverence towards their imaginary deities; supposing that the people would more readily embrace Christianity, if they perceived the rites handed down to them from their fathers, still existing unchanged among the Christians, and saw, that *Christ* and the martyrs were worshipped in the same manner as formerly their gods were. There was, accordingly, little difference in these times between the public worship of the Christians and that of the Greeks and Romans. In both there were splendid robes, mitres, tiaras, wax-tapers, staves,¹ processions, lustrations, images, gold and silver vases, and innumerable other things.

§ 2. No sooner had *Constantine* renounced the religion of his ancestors, than magnificent temples were everywhere erected, adorned with pictures and images, and both in external and internal form very similar to the fanes and temples of the gods.² These temples were of two kinds. Some were erected at the graves of the *martyrs*, and were called *Martyria*: the people assembled in these only at stated times. Others were dedicated to the ordinary and common meetings for religious worship, and were afterwards called by the Latins *Tituli*.³ Both were consecrated with great pomp and with rites borrowed in great measure from the ancient laws of the Roman pontiffs. And, what is more strange, a great part of religion was supposed to consist in a multitude of churches; and the *right of patronage*, as it is called, was introduced among Christians for no

¹ [The *crozier*, or *bishop's staff*, was exactly of the form of the *lituus*, the chief ensign of the ancient *Augurs*. See Cicero, *de Divinatione*, i. 17. Tr.]

² See Ezek. Spanheim, *Preuves sur les Césars de Julien*, p. 47; but especially, Peter le Brun, *Explication littéraire et histor. des cérémonies de la Messe*, ii. 101, &c. For a description of such a temple, see Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini Magni*, iii. 35, &c. Plates representing the interior form, are given by Wm. Beveridge, *Adnotatt. ad Pandectas Canonum*, ii. 70, and by Fred. Spanheim, *Institutt. Hist. Eccles.* in his *Opp.* i. 860. Some parts of the Christian temples were after the pattern of the Jewish temple. See Camp. Vitræ, *de Synagoga Veteri*, lib. iii. p. 466. [Some of these temples were new buildings, erected by the emperors; others were pagan temples transmuted to Christian churches. See *Codex Theodos.* lib. ix. tit. xvii. legem 2; and Jerome, *Chronicon*, ann. 332. From the Jews were borrowed, the division into the holy of holies, the holy place and the court; from which came the Chancel, the Nave, and the Porch, Βῆμα, *vads*, and νάρθηξ. Schl.]

³ John Mabillon, *Museum Italic.* tom. ii. in *Comment. ad Ordin. Roman.* p. xvi. &c. [*Tituli* appear to have been ordinary churches, as distinguished from the principal churches, now called cathedrals. The

term, as thus used, is very ancient in Rome, and appears in England so early as 787, being found in the sixth canon of the council of Calcuith. Its origin is not certainly known. *Titulus* is really an *inscription*: hence the inscription over our Lord's head, upon the cross, is called, from the Latin, τίτλος by St. John. Churches, it has been thought, were called *tituli*, either from some inscription, or other mark, which set them apart for religion, or from the tombs of the martyrs in them; tombs having been customarily called *tituli*, from the inscriptions upon them. (Du Cange, in *voc. Titul.*) Inscriptions, it seems from Ovid (*Metam.* ix. 791), were common in temples.

Dant munera templis :

Addunt et titulum : titulus breve carmen habebat.

It may be readily therefore supposed, that *titulus*, upon the principle of *pars pro toto*, might be sometimes applied to the whole building, and so used in common speech by the ancient Christians for their churches, which took the places of the heathen temples, and were ordered very much in the same way that they had been. In this case, the *inscriptions* which gave rise to the term were either, probably, to commemorate some martyr, or for some other pious or commemorative object. S.]

other reason than to induce opulent persons to build churches.¹ Thus, in this particular, the true religion evidently copied after superstition. For the ancient nations supposed that a country or province would be the more prosperous and secure, the more temples, fanes, and chapels were there erected to the gods and heroes; because the gods could not fail to show themselves patrons and defenders of those who worshipped and honoured them with so much zeal. The same sentiment prevailed among the Christians. They supposed, the more temples there were dedicated to *Christ*, to his servants and friends, the more certain they might be of assistance from *Christ* and his friends. For they supposed God, *Christ*, and the inhabitants of heaven, equally with us wretched mortals, to be delighted and captivated with external signs and expressions of respect.

§ 3. The Christian worship consisted in hymns, prayers, reading the Holy Scriptures, a discourse to the people, and finally, the celebration of the Lord's Supper. But these exercises were accompanied with various ceremonies better calculated to please the eye, than to excite true devotion.² But all congregations did not, by any means, follow the same rule and standard. Each individual bishop according to his own views, and as the circumstances of times, places, and persons suggested, prescribed to his own flock such a form of public worship as he judged best. Hence that variety of *liturgies* which were in use before the Roman pontiff arrogated to himself supreme power in religious matters, and persuaded people that they ought to copy after the principal church, the common mother of them all, as well in doctrine as in their modes of worship.

§ 4. It would carry me too far if I should run over all the parts of public worship: I will therefore content myself with a few observations. The prayers fell off greatly from the ancient simplicity and majesty, a considerable degree of vain inflation being admitted into them. Among the public hymns, the psalms which David composed were now received.³ The public discourses, among the Greeks

¹ Just. Henn. Boehmer, *Jus Eccles. Protestant.* iii. 466, &c. *Bibliothèque Italique*, v. 166, &c. [Whoever erected to any god either a larger or a smaller temple, had the right of designating the priests and attendants on the altar who should officiate there. And whoever erected a Christian temple, possessed the same right in regard to those who should minister there. This induced many persons to build churches. *Schl.* — Justinian formally gave a legal sanction to this principle, and with evident propriety. It is one of the first duties of opulence to provide religious instruction for poverty. But human beings want external inducements, even to discharge admitted and obvious duties. To give men the patronage, under episcopal supervision, of churches founded out of their own resources, was to tempt them into such acts of judicious piety by fair and appropriate means. Its opera-

tion in England has been to cover the whole country with ministers and houses of sound religion. Such, we may reasonably conclude, was the object of those who sought founders by the offer of patronage, not the puerile superstition of believing that heavenly favour might be won by a costly display of zeal. *S.*]

² The form of public worship, or the *liturgy* of this age, may be very well learned in general from Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* xxii.; and from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which are falsely ascribed to Clemens Romanus. These writers are carefully explained and interpreted by Peter le Brun, *Explication littérale et historique de la Messe*, ii. 53, &c. which is a very learned work. [See also Dr. Ernesti's *Antimurator*. p. 13, &c. *Schl.*]

³ Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichisme*, ii. 614, &c. [They were sung in course, or in

especially, were formed according to the rules of civil eloquence; and were better adapted to call forth the admiration of the rude multitude, who love display, than to amend the heart. And that no folly and no senseless custom might be omitted in their public assemblies, the people were allowed to applaud their orators as had been practised in forums and theatres—nay, more than this, they were expected to clap.¹ Who would suppose, that men professing to despise vain-glory, and set apart for instructing others in the emptiness of all human things, could possibly have become so silly?

§ 5. The *first day of the week*, on which Christians were accustomed to meet for the worship of God, *Constantine* required, by a special law, to be observed more sacredly than before.² In most societies of Christians, five festal seasons were annually observed; namely, in remembrance of the Saviour's *birth*, of his sufferings and *death* for the sins of men, of his *resurrection*, of his *ascension* to heaven, and of the *descent of the Holy Ghost* upon his ministers. Of these, the fourteen days, sacred to the memory of *Christ's* return to life, were observed with much more ceremony than the rest.³ The oriental Christians kept the memorial of the Saviour's *birth* and of his *baptism* on one and the same day, namely, the *sixth* day of January; and this day they called *Epiphany*.⁴ But the occidental Christians appear always to have consecrated the 25th day of December to the memory of the Saviour's birth. For current accounts that *Julius I.* the Roman pontiff, transferred the memorial of Christ's birth from the 6th of January to the 25th of December,⁵ seem to me very questionable. That unhappy felicity of some people in detecting the dead bodies of holy men, increased immensely *Commemorations of the martyrs*. Devout men would have readily consented to the multiplication of festivals, if the time that Christians consumed upon them had been employed in strengthening a holy frame of mind. But most people gave it up rather to idleness, pleasure, and other vices, than to God. It is well known, among other things, what

their order. Joh. Cassianus, *Institut.* l. ii. c. 2, 4, lib. iii. c. 3. Yet for the public worship on certain occasions, particular psalms were appointed (Augustine, on Ps. xxi.); and it lay with the bishop to designate what psalms he would have sung. Athanasius, *Apolog.* ii. Augustine on Ps. cxxxviii. *Schl.*]

¹ Fran. Bernh. Ferrarius, *de Veterum Acclamationibus et Plausu*, p. 66.

² Ja. Godefroi, Notes to the *Codex Theodos.* i. 135. [See Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, iv. 18, 19, 20, 23. Sozomen, *H. E.* i. 8. The principal laws of Constantine and his successors, in regard to the Lord's day and the other festivals, are collected in the *Codex Justin.* lib. iii. tit. xii. leg. 1—11. The Lord's day and the other festivals were placed on the same level. On them all, the courts of justice and the public offices were to be closed, except in certain urgent cases.

Constantine, in 321, required the inhabitants of cities and all mechanics to suspend their business on the Lord's day; but he allowed such as resided in the country full liberty to pursue their agriculture; because it was supposed necessary for them to sow their fields and prop their vines, when the weather and the season best suited. The emperor Leo, however, in 469, thought agriculture required no exception; and therefore he included farmers under the same prohibition with mechanics. See Imp. Leonis *Novellæ*, constitut. 54. *Tr.*]

³ Godefroi, Notes on the *Codex Theodos.* i. 143.

⁴ See Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, ii. 693, &c.

⁵ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, ii. 164. Alph. du Vignoles, *Dissert.* in the *Bibliothèque German.* ii. 29.

opportunities of sinning were offered to the licentious, by the *Vigils*, as they were called, of *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*.¹

§ 6. Scarcely anything was thought more effectual to repel the snares of evil spirits, and appease the Deity, than *fasting*. Hence it is easy to discover, why the rulers of the church ordained fasts by express laws, and commanded that as a necessary duty, which was before left at discretion. The *Quadragesimal fast*, as it was called,² was considered more sacred than all the rest; though it was not as yet fixed to a determinate number of days.³ But it should be remembered, that the fasts of this age differed much from those observed by Christians in preceding ages. Anciently, those who undertook to observe a fast, abstained altogether from food and drink; in this age many deemed it sufficient merely to omit the use of flesh and wine;⁴ and this opinion afterwards generally prevailed among the Latins.

§ 7. For the more convenient administration of *baptism*, sacred fountains, or *baptisteria*,⁵ were erected in the vestibules of the temples. The sacred rite itself was administered, by the light of wax-tapers, on the *pervigilium*, as they called it, of *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*.⁶ The bishop officiated, and presbyters whom he had commissioned for

¹ [Or the nocturnal meetings, held on the nights preceding the *Paschal* and *Pentecostal* festivals. *Tr.*]

² [Or *Lent*. *Tr.*—Lent is a word of Saxon origin, and properly means the *Spring*. The *Lent fast* is, therefore, merely the *Spring fast*, and was so called by the Anglo-Saxons to distinguish it from the fasts of other seasons. *S.*]

³ Joh. Daillé, *de Jejunii et Quadragesima*, lib. iv. [The Quadragesimal fast was at first of only forty hours; afterwards it was extended to several days; and at last settled at thirty-six. In the oriental churches, Lent commenced with the seventh week before Easter, because two days in each week they suspended the fast; but in the western churches, it commenced with the sixth week, because they fasted on the Sundays. Finally, Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, or, as others say, Gregory II. in the eighth, added four days, so as to make it full forty days. In the fourth century, however, the Lent Fast was in a degree optional; and the people were exhorted, with entreaties, to its observance. See Baumgarten's *Erläuterung der Christlichen Alterthüm*, p. 329, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ See Joh. Barbeyrac, *de la Morale des Péres*, p. 250, &c.

⁵ [The *Baptisteries* were properly buildings adjacent to the churches in which the catechumens were instructed, and were a sort of cisterns, into which water was let at the time of baptism, and in which the candidates were baptized by immersion. See Baumgarten's *Erläuterung der Christlichen*

Alterthüm, p. 388. *Schl.*—See also Rob. Robertson's *History of Baptism*, ch. xii. p. 67—73, ed. Benedict, 1817. *Tr.*]

⁶ [This must be taken as applying only to the church of Rome. In the eastern church, in Africa, Spain, and Gaul, baptism was also administered at the great winter festival of *Theophania*, that is, on January 6. This day was esteemed extremely appropriate for baptism, anciently in the east, because it passed, not only for that on which our Lord was born, but also for that on which he was baptized, and hence revealed as God by the visible descent upon him of the Holy Ghost. It appears by the nineteenth canon of a synod holden under St. Patrick, that baptism was administered in Ireland at Easter, Whitsuntide, and the Epiphany, or Theophany, in oriental language. Augustine, the first archbishop of Canterbury, baptized more than 10,000 persons, in one Christmas season. (*In solemnitate Dominicæ nativitatis*.) Nor does pope Gregory I. who tells us this, Epp. vii. 30, say anything against it. Of course it is not meant, that all these numbers were baptized in a single eve, or a single day. Baptism was not, in fact, absolutely restricted to such narrow limits, but might be spread, consistently with precedent, over the whole octaves of Easter, or other festivals, besides the three great festivals. This sacrament was also administered, in some places, on the feast of St. John the Baptist. See Dallæus, *De Cultibus Religiosis Latinorum*, p. 15. Suicer, in voc. *Ἐπιφάνεια*, Labb. et Coss. *Conce.* v. 1307. Spelman, *Conce.* 58. *S.*]

that purpose. In some places, salt, a symbol of purity and wisdom, was put into the mouth of the baptized: and everywhere a double anointing was used, the first before, and the other after the baptism. After being baptized, the parties wore white gowns in public during seven days. The other rites, which were either of temporary duration, or confined to certain countries, are here omitted.

§ 8. The discipline and instruction of the *catechumens* were the same in this century as the preceding. That the *Lord's Supper* was administered twice or three times a week (though in some places only on Sunday) to all who assembled for the worship of God, appears from innumerable testimonies. It was also administered at the sepulchres of the martyrs, and at funerals; whence arose, afterwards, the *masses* in honour of the saints, and for the dead. The bread and wine were now everywhere elevated, before distribution, so that they might be seen by the people, and be viewed with reverence; and hence arose, not long after, the *adoration of the symbols*. Neither *catechumens*, nor *penitents*, nor those who were supposed to be under the power of evil spirits, were allowed to be present at this sacred ordinance; nor did the sacred orators, in their public discourses, venture to speak openly and plainly concerning the true nature of it. The origin of this custom was not very honourable, as has been stated before; yet many gave an honourable reason for it, by saying, that this concealment might awaken eagerness in the *catechumens* to penetrate early into these mysteries.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE HERESIES.

§ 1. Remains of the former sects — § 2, 3. Origin of the Donatist controversy — § 4. History of the Donatists — § 5, 6. Origin of the Circumcelliones — § 7. State of the Donatists under the emperors *Julian* and *Gratian* — § 8. Their principal crime — § 9. The doctrine of this age concerning the Holy Trinity — § 10. The rise of Arianism — § 11. Its progress — § 12. The Nicene council — § 13. History of Arianism after that council — § 14. under the sons of Constantine — § 15. under Julian, Jovian, &c. — § 16. Sects among the Arians — § 17. Heresy of Apollinaris — § 18. Marcellus of Ancyra — § 19. Heresy of Photinus — § 20. That of Macedonius. The council of Constantinople — § 21, 22. The Priscillianists — § 23. The minor sects. Audæus — § 24, 25. Messalians, or Euchites.

§ 1. THE seeds and remains of those sects which were conspicuous in the preceding centuries continued in this, especially in the East; nor did they cease to make some proselytes notwithstanding the absurdity of their opinions. The *Manichaean* faction beyond others, and by its very turpitude, ensnared many; and often persons of good talents also, as appears by the example of *Augustine*. This wide-spreading pestilence, the most respectable doctors of the age, and

among them *Augustine*, when recovered from his infatuation, made efforts to arrest; some, indeed, with more learning and discrimination, and others with less, but none of them without some success. The disease, however, could not be wholly extirpated, either by books or by severe laws,¹ but after remaining latent for a time, and when most people supposed it extinct, it would break out again with greater violence. For the Manichæans, to avoid the severity of the laws, assumed successively various names, as *Encratites*, *Apotactics*, *Succophori*, *Hydroparastatae*, *Solitaries*, and others: under these names they often lay concealed for a time; but not long, for the vigilance of their enemies would find them out.²

§ 2. But the state had little to fear from these people, whose energies were gradually impaired and oppressed, in the Roman empire, by penal laws and persecutions. A much more threatening storm arose in Africa, which, though small in its commencement, kept both the church and the state in commotion for more than a century. *Mensurius*, the bishop of Carthage in Africa, dying in the year 311, the majority of the people and of the clergy elected *Cæcilian*, the archdeacon, in his place; and he was consecrated immediately, without waiting for the bishops of Numidia, by the bishops of Africa alone.³ The Numidian bishops, who, according to custom, should have been present at the consecration, took it very ill that they were excluded from this ceremony; and therefore, having assembled at Carthage, they summoned *Cæcilian* to appear before them. The feelings of these excited bishops were still more inflamed, by the efforts of certain presbyters of Carthage, especially *Botrus* and *Celesius*, the competitors of *Cæcilian*; and by an opulent lady named *Lucilla*, who was unfriendly to *Cæcilian* (by whom she had been reprovèd for her superstition), and who distributed large sums of money among those Numidians, that they might vigorously oppose the new bishop. Therefore, when *Cæcilian* refused to appear before the tribunal of these bishops, seventy in number, and headed by *Secundus*, bishop of Tigisis, they proceeded, with the approbation of a considerable part of the clergy and people of Carthage, to pronounce *Cæcilian* unworthy of his office; and then created *Majorinus*, his deacon, bishop of Carthage. Hence the Carthaginian church was divided into two factions, headed by the two bishops *Cæcilian* and *Majorinus*.

§ 3. The Numidians stated two grounds of their sentence against

¹ See in the *Codex Theodosianus*, tom. vi. pt. i. ed. Ritter, various and peculiarly severe laws of the emperors against the Manichæans. In the year 372, Valentinian senior forbade their holding meetings, and laid their preachers under heavy penalties, p. 126. In the year 381, Theodosius the Great pronounced them infamous, and deprived them of all the rights of citizens, p. 133. See other laws even more severe than these, p. 137, 138, 170, &c. [The writers who confuted the Manichæans are

very fully enumerated by Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* i. 808, &c. *Schl.*]

² See the law of Theodosius, in the *Codex Theodos.* vi. 134, 136—138. [ἐγκρατῖται, *Continents*, from their condemning marriage; ἀποτακτικοί, *set apart*, or consecrated to God; σακκοφόροι, *wearers of sackcloth*; ὑδροπαραστάται, *presenters of water*, from their using water only in the eucharist. *Tr.*]

³ [Proper, or the province of which Carthage was the capital. *Tr.*]

Cæcilian. I. That the principal bishop concerned in his consecration, *Felix* of Aptunga, was a *traditor*; that is, that during the persecution of Diocletian, he had delivered up the sacred books to the magistrates to be burned; and, therefore, that he was an apostate from *Christ*, and of course could not impart the Holy Ghost to the new bishop. II. That *Cæcilian* himself, when a deacon, had been hard-hearted and cruel to the witnesses for *Christ*, or the *martyrs*, during the Diocletian persecution; and had forbidden food to be carried to them in prison. To these two causes they added the contumacy of *Cæcilian*, who being summoned to a trial before them, refused to appear. Among these Numidian bishops, no one was more ardent and violent than *Donatus*, the bishop of *Casæ Nigræ*; whence, as most writers suppose, the whole party opposed to *Cæcilian* were from him called *Donatists*: though there are those who think the name was derived from the other *Donatus*, whom the Donatists called *the Great*.¹ In a very short time this controversy was diffused over the whole, not only of Numidia, but even of Africa; and most of the cities had two bishops, one taking sides with *Cæcilian*, and the other with *Majorinus*.

§ 4. The Donatists, having brought this controversy before *Constantine* the Great, in the year 313, the emperor committed the examination of it to *Melchiades*, the Roman bishop, with whom, as assessors, he joined three bishops from Gaul. In this court *Cæcilian* was acquitted of the charges alleged against him; but the allegations against *Felix* of Aptunga, who had consecrated him, were not examined. The emperor, therefore, in the year 314, committed the cause of *Felix* to the separate examination of *Ælian*, his proconsul for Africa, by whom *Felix* was pronounced innocent. But the Donatists raised many exceptions against the decisions of *Melchiades* and *Ælian*; and, especially, they objected to the small number of bishops who were joined with *Melchiades* as judges. They said, a formal decision of seventy venerable bishops of Numidia, ought undoubtedly to have more weight than a decree of only nineteen bishops—the number present at Rome²—and those but little

¹ In the Donatist contests, two persons of the name of Donatus distinguished themselves; the one was a Numidian, and bishop of *Casæ Nigræ*; the other was the second leader of the Donatists, succeeded *Majorinus* as bishop of Carthage, and on account of his learning and virtues, was honoured by his partisans with the title of *Great*. The learned have raised the question, From which of these men did the Donatists derive their name? Arguments of about equal strength may be adduced on both sides of this unimportant question. I should think the name was derived from both. [At the commencement of the schism, they were called (*pars Majorini*) the *Party of Majorinus*; afterwards, *Donatians* and *Donatists*; though they would not allow of this name, which was given them by the ortho-

dox. Finally, they were called (*Montenses*) *Mountaineers* (a name which they bore only at Rome [where they were obliged to hold their services in a cavern on a hill outside the city], or because they resembled the *Montanists*), also *Campitæ*, and *Rupitæ* [or *Rupitani*;—because they assembled on the plains, and among the clefts of the rocks]. *Schl.*]

² [‘The Emperor, in his letters to *Melchiades*, named no more than three prelates, viz. *Maternus*, *Rheticus*, and *Marinus*, bishops of Cologne, Autun, and Arles, to sit with him as judges of this controversy; but afterwards he ordered seven more to be added to the number, and as many as could soon and conveniently assemble; so that they were at last nineteen in all.’ *Macl.*]

acquainted with the transactions in Africa. To quiet these murmurs, the emperor, in the year 314, appointed a much larger tribunal to meet at Arles, composed of bishops from the provinces of Italy, Gaul, Germany, and Spain. Here again the Donatists lost their cause, and appealed to a trial before the emperor himself. He did not reject the appeal, but in the year 316, examined the cause at Milan, the parties being present before him. His decision also was against the Donatists;¹ and this contumacious party now cast reproaches on the emperor himself; and complained that *Hosius*, the bishop of Corduba, who was the friend both of the emperor and *Cacilian*, had corrupted the mind of the former to give an unrighteous decision. This moved the emperor's indignation, and he now (in the year 316) ordered their temples to be taken from them in Africa, and the seditious bishops to be banished; and some of them also — perhaps for the licentiousness of their tongues and pens — he caused to be put to death. Hence arose violent commotions and tumults in Africa; for the Donatist party was very numerous and powerful; and the emperor in vain strove to allay these tumults by his envoys.

§ 5. Among these formidable commotions, unquestionably sprang up those who are called *Circumcelliones*,² a body, furious, headlong, sanguinary, collected from the rude country populace. These men, siding with the Donatists, defended their cause by force of arms, and roaming through Africa, filled the province with slaughter, rapine, and conflagration, committing the most atrocious crimes against the adverse party. This mad throng, which disregarded death and every evil, nay, faced death, when there was occasion, with the greatest boldness, brought extreme odium upon the Donatists; and yet it does not appear, from any competent evidence, that the Donatist bishops, and especially those possessed of any measure of good sense

¹ No proofs could be more clear than those afforded by this whole controversy, of the supremacy of the emperor's power in matters of religion. It is obvious, that no person in that age conceived of a single supreme judge over the whole church appointed by Christ himself. The conventions at Rome and Arles are commonly called *councils*; but whoever views them impartially will perceive that they were not properly *councils*; but rather *courts* held by special judges appointed by the emperor; or, to speak in the language of modern times, by *Commissaries*. [To this opinion Dr. Walch subscribes, *Hist. Ketz.* iv. 343, &c., where he says: 'The whole history speaks out loudly, that in settling this controversy and restoring peace, the bishop of Rome did nothing, and the emperor everything. In the numerous transactions, the bishop Melchiodas appears only once, and then not as supreme head of the church, but merely as the emperor's *commissioner*, charged with the execution of *his* commands. No papal ordinance, no appeal to the court

of Rome, no *dernier* decision, was here once thought of. So the ecclesiastical law of Africa, in that age, had no article respecting the authority of the pope. On the contrary, from the commencement till the final subjugation of the Donatists, we everywhere meet with the *emperor*, imperial trials, imperial commissioners, imperial laws, imperial punishments, imperial executive officers, all in full operation.' *Schl.*]

² [They were called *Circumcelliones* (*vagrants*), or by contraction, *Circeliones*; from the (*cellæ*) cottages of the peasants, around which they hovered, having no fixed residence. They styled themselves *Agonistici* (*combatants*), pretending that they were *combating* and vanquishing the devil. Walch, *l. c.* p. 157, thinks it cannot be proved that the *Circumcelliones* appeared on the stage before the time of Constans. *Schl.* — It has been thought that the Donatists represent a *native* religious movement against the Latin-speaking churches on the coast. Debary, *Notes of Residence in Spain and Algiers* (London, 1851), p. 344. *Ed.*]

and religion, approved or instigated their proceedings. The storm continuing to increase, and seeming to threaten a civil war, *Constantine*, after attempting a reconciliation without effect, at the suggestion of the prefects of Africa, repealed the laws against the Donatists,¹ and gave the African people full liberty to follow either of the contending parties, as they liked best.²

§ 6. After the death of *Constantine* the Great, his son *Constans*, to whom Africa had fallen, in the year 348, sent into that country *Macarius* and *Paulus*, as his lieutenants, to heal this deplorable schism, and to persuade the Donatists to reconciliation with the orthodox. But the chief Donatist bishop, *Donatus*, whom this sect denominated the Great, strenuously opposed a reconciliation; and the other bishops followed his example. The *Circumcelliones* also contended furiously, with slaughter and arms, for the party which they had espoused. After *Macarius* had vanquished these in battle at Bagnia,³ he no longer recommended, but commanded peace and reconciliation. A few *Donatists* obeyed; the majority either fled, or were sent into banishment, among whom was *Donatus* the Great; and many suffered the severest punishments. In this persecution of the Donatists, which lasted thirteen years, many things were done, as the *Catholics* themselves concede,⁴ which no upright, impartial, and humane person can well say were righteous and just. And hence the numerous complaints made by the Donatists of the cruelty of their adversaries.⁵

§ 7. *Julian*, on his accession to the government of the empire, permitted the Donatists, in the year 362, to return to their country, and enjoy their former liberty. After their return they drew, in a short time, the greater part of Africa into their communion.⁶ *Gratian* enacted indeed some laws against them; and especially in 377,

¹ [A. D. 321. *Tr.*]

² [The Donatists now became very numerous throughout Africa. In some places they were more numerous than the Catholics. In 330, one of their councils consisted of no less than 270 bishops. See *Augustine*, Ep. 93. *Tr.*]

³ [Or Bagaja. *Tr.*]

⁴ I will here give a quotation from Optatus of Milevis, whom none will refuse as a witness; *de Schismate Donatistar.* lib. iii. § 1, p. 51, ed. Du Pin: 'Ab Operariis unitatis' (the imperial legates Macarius and Paulus) 'multa quidam aspere gesta sunt. — Fugerunt omnes Episcopi cum clericis suis, aliqui sunt mortui: qui fortiores fuerunt, capti et longe relegati sunt.' Through this whole book, Optatus is at much pains to apologize for this severity, the blame of which he casts upon the Donatists. Yet he does not dissemble, that all of it cannot by any means be approved or justified.

⁵ See the *Collatio Carthagin. diæi tertie*, § 258, at the end of Optatus, p. 315.

⁶ [When the Donatists returned, under

the permission of Julian, they demanded of the orthodox the restoration of their churches. And as they were not willing to give them up, and as little could be expected from the civil authorities, the Donatists felt justified in depending upon their own strength. Most unhappy proceedings ensued, which have brought lasting disgrace upon the Donatists. Bloodshed, merciless denial of the necessities of life, violation of females, in a word, the worst excesses of an oppressed party which, after long continued sufferings felt itself authorised to take unsparing revenge, attended the restoration of the Donatists; and by craft and violence must their churches be built up. The orthodox made resistance, and would not tamely suffer abuse. And hence arose those tumultuous scenes which the magistrates reported to the court; and very probably, had Julian lived a little longer, persecuting laws would have been issued by the government. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iv. 175. *Schl.*]

commanded all their temples to be taken from them, and all their assemblies, even in the fields and private houses, to be broken up.¹ But the fury of the *Circumcelliones*, who were the soldiery of the Donatists, and the fear of producing intestine war, prevented, no doubt, the vigorous execution of these laws; for it appears that in the conclusion of this century the Donatist community in Africa was so extensive as to have more than four hundred bishops. As the century drew to a close, however, two things impaired not a little the energies of this very flourishing community. The one was a great schism that arose in it, occasioned by one *Maximinus*;² than which nothing could more aid the Catholics in opposing the Donatists. The other was the zeal against them of *Augustine*, first a presbyter, and then bishop of Hippo. For he assailed them most vigorously, by his writings, discourses, conferences, advice, admonitions, and by conventions; and as his talents were such as command attention everywhere, he roused against them, not only Africa, but all Christendom besides, including the court itself.³

§ 8. The Donatists were sound in doctrine, as their adversaries admit; nor were their lives censurable, if we except the enormities of the *Circumcelliones*, which were detested by the greatest part of the Donatists. Their fault was, that they considered the African church to have fallen from the rank and privileges of a true church, and to be without the gifts of the Holy Spirit from its adherence to *Cucilian*, on account of that man's offences, and those of his consecrator, *Felix* of Aptunga. All other churches likewise, which were associated and connected with this in Africa, they looked upon as defiled and polluted. For their own body, on account of the sanctity of its bishops, they claimed exclusively the name of a true, pure, and holy church; nor, in consequence of these opinions, would they hold any communion with other churches, for fear of contracting some defilement. This error led them to maintain that the sacred rites and administrations of Christians who disagreed with them were destitute of all efficacy. Hence they not only re-baptized such as came over to them from other societies, but also excluded from the sacred office, or reordained such ministers of religion as joined their community. This pestilence scarcely extended beyond Africa; for the few small congregations which the Donatists formed in Spain and Italy, had no permanence, but were soon broken up.⁴

¹ [*Codex Theodos.* l. ii. Ne sanct. Bapt. interitur. *Schl.*]

² [On this schism among the Donatists, and others of less magnitude, see Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iv. 258—267. *Schl.*]

³ [A full catalogue of the writings of Augustine against the Donatists is given by Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iv. 254, &c., and of his other efforts against them, an account is given, *ibid.* p. 181, &c. *Schl.* Augustine's treatment of the Donatists has been made the grounds of a charge against him, of first sanctioning the horrid principle, that

Heretics are to be punished with temporal punishments and death. Cf. Ep. 48, ad Vincent. and Ep. 50, ad Bonifac. &c. But it is quite clear that the orthodox were compelled in self-defence to invoke the existing laws against the Donatists, and that Augustine interfered to prevent the extreme severities sanctioned by the imperial edicts. See Robertson, *Ch. Hist.* i. 370, 371. *Ed.*]

⁴ A more full account of the Donatists is given by Hen. Valesius, *Diss. de Schismate Donatistarum*, which is subjoined to his

§ 9. Not long after the commencement of the Donatist controversy, or in the year 317, another storm arose in Egypt, more pernicious and of greater consequence, which spread its ravages over the whole Christian world. The ground of this contest was the doctrine of *three persons in the Godhead*; a doctrine which, during the three preceding centuries, had not been in all respects defined. It had, indeed, often been decided, in opposition to the Sabellians and others, that there is a *real* difference between the Father and the Son, and also between them and the Holy Spirit; or, as we commonly express it, that there are three distinct persons in the Godhead. But the mutual relations of these persons, and the nature of the difference between them, had not been a subject of dispute, and therefore nothing had been decreed by the church on these points. Much less was there any prescribed phraseology which it was necessary to use when speaking on this mystery. The doctors, therefore, explained this subject in different ways, and gave various representations of the difference between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, without offence being taken. In Egypt and the neighbouring countries, the greater part had, in this article as well as others, followed the opinions of *Origen*, who had taught that the *Son is in God*, what *reason is in man*, and that the Holy Spirit is nothing else than the *divine energy* or *power of acting* and working; which opinion, if it be not cautiously stated, may lead, among other difficulties, to the subversion of any real distinction between the divine persons, or in other words to Sabellianism.

§ 10. *Alexander*, the bishop of Alexandria—it is uncertain on what occasion—expressed himself rather freely on this subject in a meeting of his presbyters; and maintained, among other things, that the Son possesses not only the same dignity as the Father, but also the same *essence*.¹ But *Arius*, one of the presbyters, a man of an acute mind, and fluent, influenced perhaps by ill-will towards his bishop,² at first denied the truth of *Alexander's* positions, on the ground that they were allied to the Sabellian errors, which had been condemned by the

edition of Eusebius' *H. E.*: by Thos. Ittig, *Historia Donatismi*; in an appendix to his book, *de Hæresibus Ævi Apostolici*, p. 241; by Herm. Witsius, *Miscellaneor. Sacror.* t. i. lib. iv. p. 742; by Hen. Noris, *Historia Donatiana*; a posthumous work, which the brothers Ballerini enlarged and published, Opp. iv. xlv. &c.; and by Thos. Long, *History of the Donatists*, London, 1677, 8vo. The narrative we have given above, is derived from the original sources; and, if our life is spared, it will in due time be corroborated by a statement of the requisite testimonies. [What Mosheim was prevented from fulfilling, by his death, his successor in the professorial chair of church history, *Dr. Walch*, accomplished, in *Hist. Ketz.* iv. 1—354. *Schl.*]

¹ See Socrates, *H. E.* i. 5. Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 2.

² [Arius is said to have been a candidate for the episcopal throne when Alexander was elected. Philostorgius, *H. E.* i. 3, an Arian writer, says that he had a majority of votes, but waived his right in favour of Alexander. Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 2, imputes his conduct to jealousy; but this wants proof. The Arians charge Alexander with envy and personal hatred of Arius; but this, which is not proved, would not account for Arius being the aggressor, as he certainly was. Doubtless, personal feelings entered into this contest, as into all others; but there is no need to give them more than their due weight, or to impute them without authority, when the circumstances are quite as intelligible without the imputation. Schlegel, who tries to be impartial, quotes Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 395. *Ed.*]

church : and then, going to the opposite extreme, he maintained, that the Son is totally and *essentially* distinct from the Father ; that he was, in fact, only the first and noblest of those created beings whom God the Father formed out of nothing, and the instrument which the Father used in creating this material universe ; and, therefore, that he was inferior to the Father both in *nature* and in *dignity*.¹ What

¹ [Both Alexander and Arius have left us statements, each of his own doctrinal views, and also what he understood to be the sentiments of his antagonist. The statements are in their private letters, written after long and public discussions at Alexandria, and when Arius and his friends were cast out of the church. The letter of Alexander is addressed to his namesake, Alexander of Byzantium, and that of Arius to his friend Eusebius of Nicomedia. Both are preserved by Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 4, 5. Alexander states that Arius and his adherents, ‘Denying the divinity of our Saviour, pronounced him τοῖς πᾶσιν ἴσον εἶναι, on a level with all other creatures.’ He says that they held, ‘there was a time, when the Son of God was not ; and he who once had not existence, afterwards did exist ; and from that time was, what every man naturally is ; for (say they) God made all things of nothing, including the Son of God in this creation of all things both rational and irrational : and of course, pronouncing him to be of a changeable nature, and capable of virtue and of sin.—The doctrine just risen up in opposition to the piety of the church, is that of Ebion and Artemas, and is an imitation of that of Paul of Samosata.’ Alexander then gives his own views, as follows : ‘We believe, as the Apostolic church does, in the only unbegotten Father, who derived his existence from no one, and is immutable and unalterable, always the same and uniform, unsusceptible of increase or diminution ; the giver of the law and the prophets and the gospels ; Lord of the patriarchs and apostles and of all saints ; and in one Lord, Jesus Christ ; the only begotten Son of God ; begotten not from nothing, but from the living Father ; and not after the manner of material bodies, by separations and effluxes of parts, as Sabellius and Valentinian supposed ; but in an inexplicable and indescribable manner, agreeably to the declaration before quoted. “Who shall declare his generation?” For his existence (ὑπόστασις) is inscrutable to all mortal beings ; just as the Father is inscrutable ; because created intelligences are incapable of understanding this divine generation from the Father.—No one knoweth what the Father is, but the Son ; and no one knoweth what the Son is, but the Father.—He is unchangeable, as much as the Father ; lacks nothing ; is the perfect

Son, and the absolute likeness of the Father, save only that he is not unbegotten.—Therefore to the unbegotten Father, his proper dignity (οὐκείον ἀξίωμα) must be preserved. And to the Son also suitable honour must be given, by ascribing to him an eternal generation (ἀναρχὸν γέννησιν) from the Father.’ Such is the statement of Alexander, on account of that all-conquering truth which thou also defendest, greeting in the Lord. As my father Ammonius is going to Nicomedia, it seemed proper for me to address you by him, and to acquaint the native love and affection which you exercise towards the brethren for God and his Christ’s sake, that the bishop greatly oppresses and persecutes us, putting everything in motion against us ; and so as to drive us out of the city, as if we were Atheists ; because we do not agree with him, publicly asserting, that God always was, and the Son always was ; that he was always the Father, always the Son ; that the Son was *of* God himself ; and that because your brother Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Theodotus, and Paulinus, and Athanasius, and Gregory, and Aëtius, and all they of the East, say that God was before the Son, and without beginning, they are accursed ; except only Philogonius, and Hellanicus and Macarius, unlearned and heretical men, who say of the Son, one of them, that he is an eructation, another, that he is an emission, and another, that he is equally unbegotten ; which impieties we could not even hear, though the heretics should threaten us with a thousand deaths. As to what we say and believe, we have taught, and still teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor a portion of the unbegotten, in any manner : nor was he formed out of any subjacent matter, but that, in will and purpose, he existed before all times and before all worlds, perfect God (πλήρης Θεός), the only-begotten, unchangeable ; and that before he was begotten, or created, or purposed, or established, he was not ; for he was never unbegotten. We are persecuted, because we say, the Son had a beginning, but God was without beginning. We are also persecuted, because we say, that he is from nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐστίν) ; and this we say,

were his views of the Holy Spirit is not equally manifest. That his views of the Son of God were combined with some other opinions differing from the common sentiments of Christians cannot be doubted. But no one of the ancients has left us a connected and systematic account of the religion professed by Arius and his associates.¹

inasmuch as he is not a portion of God, nor formed from any subjacent matter. Therefore we are persecuted. The rest you know. I bid you adieu in the Lord."—According to these statements, both the Arians and the orthodox considered the Son of God and Saviour of the world, as a derived existence, and as *generated* by the Father. But they differed on two points. I. The Orthodox believed his generation was *from eternity*, so that he was coeval with the Father. But the Arians believed, there was a time when the Son was not. II. The Orthodox believed the Son to be derived of and from the Father; so that he was *ὁμοούσιος*, of the same essence with the Father. But the Arians believed, that he was formed out of nothing, *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων εἶναι*, by the creative power of God. Both, however, agreed in calling him God, and in ascribing to him divine perfections. As to his offices, or his being the Saviour of sinful men, it does not appear, that they differed materially in their views. Indeed so imperfect and fluctuating were the views of that age respecting the offices of Christ and the way in which sinners are saved, that he was, for aught they could see, an equally competent Saviour, whether he were a finite creature, or the infinite and all-perfect God. Hence both the Arians and the orthodox then embraced the same system of theology in substance; and the chief importance, in a theological view, of their controversy respecting the Sonship of Christ, related to the assigning him that rank in the universe which properly belonged to him. *Tr.*—Arius first published his heresy about the year 319. Newman's *Arians in the fourth century*, 255. S.]

¹ The history of the Arian contests is to be drawn from Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini Magni*; from various tracts of Athanasius, *Opp.* tom. i.; from the *Eccles. Histories* of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret; from Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lix.; and from other writers of this and the following century. But among all these, there is not one whom we may justly pronounce free from partiality. And the Arian history still needs a writer of integrity, and void alike of hatred and love. There were faults on both sides; but those who hitherto have described this controversy, could discover the faults of only one of the parties. It is a common opinion, that Arius was too much attached

to the sentiments of Plato and Origen. See Dion, Petavius, *Dogmat. Theol.* tom. ii. l. i. c. 8, p. 38. But those who think so are certainly in an error. For Origen and Plato differ widely from Arius; on the contrary it cannot well be doubted, that Alexander, the opposer of Arius, in his explanation of the doctrine of three Persons in one God, closely followed the footsteps of Origen. See Ralph Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, vol. i. p. 676, &c. [Although Arianism broke out in Alexandria, its origin may be traced to the corrupt state of the church of Antioch, in which city Arius and his principal supporters had been pupils of Lucian the Martyr: Paul of Samosata had introduced at Antioch a very lax school of theology, combining the disputatious spirit of the sophist with certain Judaic and eclectic tendencies. Lucian, although opposed in opinion to Paul, who was a liberal Sabellian, was his friend, and shared his sceptical sentiment. In doctrine, he was what afterwards was called Semi-Arian, and may be looked on as the founder of the Arian heresy. On the other hand, the Alexandrian church was opposed to eclecticism (which at Alexandria was external to the church), and characterised rather by mystical obscurity than by shallow scepticism. See Newman's *Arians*. I subjoin from Bright's *History of the Church*, from 313—451, an enumeration of the moral attractions of Arianism: 'What was the charm that Arianism possessed during so many years for adherents so diverse both in race and character? First, it was a form of rationalism, and therefore a relief to minds that shrunk from so awful a mystery as the incarnation of the Eternal. Secondly, it was a vague elastic creed, congenial to those who disliked all definite doctrine. Thirdly, it appealed to many by its affinity to older heresies. Fourthly, its assertion of a created and inferior Godhead would come home to persons in transition from polytheism to Christianity. Fifthly, the scope which it practically allowed to a profane and worldly temper was agreeable to the multitudes for whom the church was too austere, who desired a relaxed and adapted gospel. Lastly, who can tell how many simple souls were allured by the promise of a safeguard against Sabellianism or against carnal views of the nature of God?' P. 14. *Ed.*]

§ 11. The opinions of *Arius* were no sooner divulged, than they found very many abettors, and among them men of distinguished talents and rank, both in Egypt and the neighbouring provinces. *Alexander*, on the other hand, accused *Arius* of blasphemy before two councils assembled at Alexandria, and cast him out of the church.¹ He was not at all discouraged by this disgrace, but retiring to Palestine, he wrote various letters to men of distinction, in which he laboured to demonstrate the truth of his doctrines, and with so much success that he drew over infinite numbers to his side, and in particular *Eusebius*, bishop of Nicomedia, who was a man of immense influence.² The emperor *Constantine*, who considered the discussion as relating to a matter of little importance, and remote from the fundamentals of religion, at first addressed the disputants by letter, admonishing them to desist from contention.³ But when he

¹ [Alexander first employed milder measures; for he sent a letter, which was subscribed by the clergy of Alexandria, to Arius and the other clergymen united with him, warning them to abandon their error. (Athanasius, *Opp.* tom. i. pt. i. p. 396.) When this measure failed, he brought the subject before the bishops of his party. He first held a council at Alexandria (A.D. 321), composed of Egyptian and Libyan bishops; and then another assembly, composed only of the presbyters and deacons of the city of Alexandria and the province of Marcotis. The first was properly a council; the other was not. And hence it is, that some historians speak of but one council of Alexandria. See Walch's *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 140; *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 424, &c. *Schl.*]

² [These bishops held a council in Bithynia, probably at Nicomedia, in which 250 bishops are reported to have been present. Of their acts and decisions, we know nothing more than that they sent letters to all the bishops of Christendom, intreating them not to exclude the friends of Arius from their communion, and requesting them to intercede with Alexander, that he would not do so. Sozomen, *H. E.* i. 16. See Nicetas, in *Biblioth. Max. Patr.* xxv. 151; and Ceiller's *Histoire des Auteurs*, iii. 566. Walch, *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 142. *Tr.*]

³ [Constantine not only wrote a letter in 324, but he sent with it, as his envoy, the famous Hosius, bishop of Corduba. What part the envoy acted is unknown, but the letter is extant, fully, in Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini* M. ii. 64—72, and with some curtailment, in Socrates, *H. E.* i. 7. The most important part of this singular document, which, however, shows the feelings of one more solicitous for the great cause of our common Christianity, than for absolute perfection in speculative theology, is as follows:—

‘I learn, then, that the origin of the

present controversy was thus:—Whereas you, Alexander, inquired of the presbyters, what each believed on one of the subjects contained in the law, or rather on a point of a vain controversy; and whereas you, Arius, inconsiderately advanced what ought not to have entered your mind—or, if it did, should have been smothered in silence; hereupon dissension arose between you, communion has been denied; and the most holy people, being split into two parties, the harmony of the whole body is destroyed. Wherefore do ye, mutually forgiving one another, follow the counsel herefitly offered you by your fellow worshipper [of the true God]. And what is it? It is, that it was unsuitable, at first, to put a question on such subjects; and when it was put, it was unsuitable to answer it. For such questions, being required by no law, but prompted by the contentiousness of unprofitable leisure—though they may be proposed for the exercise of our natural powers—ought to be kept to ourselves, and not rashly to be brought before public meetings, nor be inconsiderately trusted to the ears of the people. For, how few are there that can accurately comprehend and suitably explain the nature of so great and so exceedingly difficult subjects? Yet if any one thinks he could easily do this, how large a part of the people will he persuade to think so? or who can urge the critical examination of such questions, without hazarding a fall? Wherefore, prating on such subjects is to be restrained; lest, either from the imbecility of our natures, we should be unable to explain the subject proposed, or from the dullness of apprehension in our hearers, they should not be able to comprehend exactly what is spoken; and lest, from one or the other of these causes, the people should incur the danger either of blasphemy or schism. Therefore, let an unwise question in the one, and an inconsiderate answer in the other of you, mutually pardon each

found that nothing was effected by this measure, and that greater commotion was daily rising throughout the empire, he summoned in the year 325, that famous council of the whole church which met at *Nice*, in Bithynia, to put an end to this controversy. In this council, after various altercations and conflicts of the bishops, the doctrine of *Arius* was condemned, *Christ* was pronounced to be (ὁμοούσιος) *of the same essence* with the Father, *Arius* was sent into exile in Illyricum, and his followers were compelled to assent to a *Creed*, or confession of faith, composed by the council.¹

other. For the controversy between you is not about the chief of the precepts of our law (the holy Scripture); nor have you introduced any new heresy relating to practical religion; but you both have one and the same views, so that you may easily come together in the bonds of fellowship. While you thus contend about little and exceedingly unimportant points (ὅτι μικρῶν καὶ λίαν ἐλαχίστων), it is not suitable for so numerous a body of God's people to be under your guidance, on account of your dissension: indeed, it is not only unsuitable, but it is believed to be absolutely unlawful. That I may admonish your sagacity, by a smaller instance, I will say; all those philosophers who profess one system of doctrine, you know very often differ on some part of their positions. But though they disagree in the perfection of their knowledge, yet on account of their union as to the system of their doctrine, they come together again harmoniously. Now if *they* do so, how much more reasonable is it for *you*, the appointed ministers of the great God, to be of one heart in the profession of the same religion? Let us look more attentively and closely into what is now advanced. *Is it right*, on account of the little vain disputes about words among you, for brethren to array themselves against brethren, and the precious assembly to be rent asunder by the ungodly strife of you who thus contend about trifles of no necessity? (ὅτι μικρῶν ὄντων καὶ μηδαμῶς ἀναγκαίων;) This is vulgar and despicable: it is more befitting the folly of children, than the discretion of priests and wise men. Let us spontaneously depart from the temptations of the devil. Our great God, the common preserver of us all, hath extended to all the common light; and allow me, his servant, under his providence, to bring my efforts to a successful issue, that by my admonitions, diligence, and earnest exhortations, I may bring his people to have fellowship in their meeting together. For since, as I said, ye both have one faith (μία τίς ἐστὶν ὑμῖν πίστις), and one and the same understanding of our religion (καὶ μία τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς αἰρέσεως σύνεσις); and since the requirement of the law, in its various parts, binds all to one consent and purpose

of mind; and as this thing which has produced a little strife among you, does not extend to the power and efficacy of the whole gospel (μὴ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ παντὸς δύναμιν ἀνῆκει), let it not at all produce separations and commotions among you. And these things I say, not to compel you to a perfect consent on this very unwise and undefinable question. For the high privileges of communion may be preserved to you unimpaired, and the same fellowship may be kept up among you all, though there may be among you partial disagreement about some trivial point. For we do not all choose alike, nor is there one and the same disposition and judgment in us all. Therefore, concerning the divine Providence, let there be one faith, one understanding, and one covenant with God. But as for those trivial questions, which ye so elaborately discuss, though you should not think exactly alike, it is fit that the fact remain within your own cogitations, and be kept as a secret in your own breast. Let the privileges of mutual friendship, and the belief of the truth, and the precious worship of God and observance of his law, remain unimpaired among you. Return again to mutual friendship and charity; give to all the people their proper embraces; and, having purified as it were your own minds, do ye again recognise each other: for friendship, when it returns to a reconciliation, after ill will is laid aside, often becomes more sweet than before. And restore to me also serene days, and nights void of care, so that there may be in reserve for me the enjoyment of the pure light, and the pleasures of a quiet life. If this fail, I must unavoidably sigh and be bathed in tears, and spend the residue of my days uneasily. For while the people of God, my fellow worshippers, are so rent asunder by unreasonable and hurtful contentions, how can my mind be at ease, and my thoughts at rest? *Tr.*]

¹ This *creed* is illustrated from ancient records, in a learned work on the subject, by Joh. Christ. Suicer, Utrecht, 1718, 4to. [The creed used in the Romish, Lutheran, and English churches, and called the Nicene creed, is in reality the creed set forth by the council of Constantinople in the year 381.

§ 12. No part of church history, perhaps, has acquired more celebrity than this assembly of bishops at Nice to settle the affairs of the church; and yet it is very singular that scarcely any part of it has been treated and illustrated more negligently.¹ The ancient writers are not agreed as to the time and year, nor the place, nor the number of the judges, nor the president of this council, nor as to many other particulars.² No written *journal* of the proceedings of

It is considerably more full than the original Nicene creed; which is here subjoined, together with a translation. Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτῆστι, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι' ἡμῶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντες εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν τρεπτόν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. See Walch, *Biblioth. Symbol. Vetus*, p. 75, 76. Translation: We believe in one God, the Father, almighty, the maker of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only-begotten (that is), of the substance of the Father; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten not made; of the same substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, that are in heaven and that are in earth: who for us men, and for our salvation, descended, and was incarnate, and became man; suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens; and will come to judge the living and the dead: and in the Holy Ghost. But those who say, that there was a time when he was not, and that he was not before he was begotten, and that he was made out of nothing, or affirm that he is of any other substance or essence, or that the Son of God is created, and mutable or changeable, the catholic church doth pronounce accursed. *Tr.*

¹ See Tho. Ittig, *Historia Concilii Niceni*; published after his death. [Lips. 1712, 4to.] Jo. Le Clerc, *Bibliothèque Historique et Universelle*, tom. x. p. 421, and tom. xxii. p. 291. Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire de Manichéisme*, tom. i. p. 520, &c. The accounts left us by the orientals of this council are contained in Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 69, &c. [Walch's *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 144—168. *Schl.*]

² [Yet there is not great disagreement on most of these points; the *year* was A.D. 325; there is a disagreement as to the *month*, namely, whether it was the 13th of the Kalends of June, or July; that is, the 20th of *May*, or the 19th of *June*. All agree that the council closed on the emperor's Vicenalia. As to the *place*, there is overwhelming proof that it was the central hall or building in the imperial palace at Nice in Bithynia; which the emperor caused to be fitted up especially for the purpose. [The earlier sessions appear to have been held in a church (perhaps the Gymnasium used as a church), but after the arrival of the emperor the council was transferred to the palace. *Ed.*] As to the *number of members*, Eusebius, indeed (*de Vita Constantini*, iii. 8), says, 'they exceeded 250 bishops.' Socrates (*H. E.* i. 8) says, 'they exceeded 300 bishops.' There is satisfactory proof that there were 318 members of the council; besides a vast number of clergy and others. The ancient writers make no mention whatever of any *president* or *scribe* of the council. [Hosius of Cordova was the first to sign the Canons; Eustathius of Antioch and Eusebius of Cæsarea seem to have acted as spokesmen; the prelate of highest rank present was Alexander of Alexandria, but Eustathius, within whose patriarchate Nice was, probably acted as president. *Ed.*] They represent the council as assembling, and the emperor as entering, advancing to the upper end of the hall, and upon a signal from the bishops, taking his seat, which was a golden chair; after which the whole council was seated; several of the principal bishops on the right and left of the emperor, and the main body of them arranged on the two sides of the hall. Before this formal opening of the council, there were several encounters of the bishops of different parties, and also of members of the council, with the philosophers and others who were assembled in the city. Of these private meetings, pompous accounts are left us by Gelasius and others. When the council assembled in form they did no business, but remained silent, till the emperor came in. He was then addressed either by Eustathius of Antioch, or Eusebius of Cæsarea, or by both, in short complimentary speeches; after which, he himself harangued the council; and having thrown into the fire, unread, all

this venerable tribunal was kept; at least none has reached us.¹ As to how many, and what enactments were passed in it, Christians in the east, and those elsewhere, give different accounts. The latter only reckon twenty: the orientals many more.² From the canons

the private petitions and complaints which had been previously handed him, he bade them proceed to business. A free discussion now ensued. Men of different sentiments offered their opinions; and the emperor heard, remarked, commended, or disapproved, and so influenced the whole proceedings, as to bring about a good degree of unanimity. Yet he did not act the dictator or judge; but left the bishops to decide all the questions respecting faith and discipline, uncontrolled; for he regarded *them* as the divinely constituted judges of such matters. He only wished them to come to *some* agreement; which as soon as they had done, he regarded their decision as final, and as obligatory on himself as well as all others. How many sessions were held, we are not told. But after all the business was finished, on the 25th of July, when the emperor entered on the twentieth year of his reign, he celebrated his Vicennalia with the council, in a splendid banquet in his own palace. On that occasion, Eusebius of Cæsarea delivered an oration in praise of Constantine, which is lost. After the feast [about the 25th of August] the bishops were dismissed, with presents and exhortations to peace and love. They returned, as they came, by the public conveyances, having been supported by the emperor from the time they left their homes. See Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, iii. 6—22. Socrates, *H. E.* i. 8—11. Sozomen, *H. E.* i. 17—25. Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 7, 9, 10 12. Rufinus, *H. E.* lib. i. Gelasius Cyzicenus, *Commentar. de Synodo Nicæna*, lib. iii. in Harduin's *Concilia*, i. 345, &c. *Acta Concilii Nicæni*, in Combefis' *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.* ii. 573. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 69, &c.; various treatises in the first volume of the works of Athanasius, especially his *Epistola de Nicænis Decretis*; and several detached passages in Epiphanius, *contra Hæreses*, lib. iii. These are the only authentic sources for the history of this council. *Tr.*—See Stanley's *Eastern Church*, lect. ii.—v. *Ed.*]

¹ See Henry Valesius, Note on Euseb. *de Vita Constantini* M. iii. 14. Maruthas, a Syrian, wrote a history of this council; but it is lost. See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic.* i. 195, &c. [Eusebius, l. c. says: 'What met the general approbation of the council, was committed to writing, and confirmed by the subscription of each member.' Whence Valesius infers, that *nothing* was committed to writing by

the council, except the *creed*, the *canons*, and the *synodic epistle*. He therefore supposes that the council kept no *Journal*, or had no written *Acta Concilii*, in the technical sense of the phrase. What are called the *Acta Concilii*, given by Gelasius and others, are an account of various discussions between individual members of the council and certain philosophers or sophists, together with the creed, the canons, the synodic letter, several epistles of the emperor, one of Eusebius to his church of Cæsarea, and various extracts from ancient authors. *Tr.*]

² Thom. Ittig, *Supplem. Opp. Clementis Alex.* p. 191. Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatic.* i. 22, 195, &c. Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 71, and many others. [The twenty Nicene canons only were received by the ancient church. Some attempts, indeed, were made by the bishops of Rome, in the fifth century, to make certain canons of the council of Sardica pass for canons of the council of Nice. On that occasion, the African bishops resisted, and sent to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, for complete copies of all the Nicene canons which they knew of. The returns showed, that these twenty canons only were then recognised in the Greek church. See the Acts of the sixth council of Carthage, A. D. 419. Theodoret also (*H. E.* i. 8), and Gelasius Cyzicenus (ii. 31), expressly affirms, that the number of the Nicene canons was twenty. But in the sixteenth century, an Arabic copy of eighty canons, including these twenty, was brought from Alexandria to Rome, and soon afterwards translated and published. At first, there was some doubt; but in a short time all the learned were fully satisfied that the additional sixty canons were not of Nicene origin, though now regarded as such by most of the eastern Christians. [They are, in fact, an Arabic version of the whole body of ancient ecclesiastical canons, attributed by mistake to the council of Nice. Neale, *Patr. Alex.* i. 149. *Ed.*] See Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles.* cent. iv. dissert. xviii. vol. vii. p. 501—511; ed. Paris, 1742, 4to.—These twenty canons (or twenty-two, as some divide them) are extant in Beveridge's *Pandect. Canon.* i. 58, &c., and in all the larger collections of councils. The substance of them is as follows: The first canon forbids the admission of voluntary, or self-made, eunuchs to the sacred ministry. The second forbids the hasty ordination of

universally received, and from other monuments, it appears, not only that *Arius* was condemned by this council, but also that other things were decreed with a view to settle the affairs of the church. In particular the controversy respecting the time of celebrating Easter, which had long perplexed Christians, was terminated; the Novatian disturbance, respecting the re-admission of the lapsed to communion, was composed; the Meletian schism, with its causes, was censured; the jurisdiction of the greater bishops was defined; and other matters of a like nature were determined.¹ But while the prelates were eager

new converts to Christianity, agreeably to 1 Tim. iii. 6, 'Not a novice,' &c. The third forbids clergymen, of all ranks, from having subinduced females or housekeepers; except only their nearest blood relations. The fourth directs that ordinations [of bishops] be generally performed by all the bishops of a province; and never by less than three bishops: and requires the confirmation of the metropolitan in all cases. The fifth requires, that an excommunication either of a clergyman or a layman, by the sentence of a single bishop, shall be valid everywhere till it is examined and judged of by a provincial council; and requires such a council to be held for this and other objects of general interest twice a year, once in the autumn, and once a little before Easter. The sixth secures to the patriarch of Alexandria all the rights which he claimed by ancient usage, over the bishops and churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; also to the patriarchs of Rome and Antioch, their prerogatives; and gives to metropolitans generally a negative on all elections to the episcopal office within their respective provinces. The seventh gives to the bishop of *Ælia* (or Jerusalem) the rank of a metropolitan; but without depriving *Cæsarea*, the ancient metropolis, of its dignity. The eighth permits Novatian bishops and clergymen to return to the church, and retain their rank and offices, on their assenting to the rules of the church respecting second marriages, and communion with the lapsed. The ninth and tenth require, that presbyters who before their ordination had lapsed, or had committed any other offence which was a canonical disqualification for the sacred office, be deprived of their office as soon as the disqualification is ascertained. The eleventh requires the lapsed, during the late persecution under *Licinius*, *first*, to do penance three years without the doors of the church; *secondly*, seven years in the porch among the catechumens; and *thirdly*, to be allowed to witness, but not join in, the celebration of the eucharist for two years more. The twelfth requires flagrant apostates to go through the same course, but they must spend ten years in the *second stage*. Yet the bishops are to exercise discretionary power in regard to the length

of time. The thirteenth allows the *viaticum* to be given to any penitent who seems to be dying; but if he recovers, he is to rank only with the penitents in the *third stage*. By the fourteenth, lapsed *catechumens* are to spend three years in the *first stage*. By the fifteenth, the translation of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, from one church to another, is forbidden. By the sixteenth, presbyters or deacons, forsaking their own churches and going over to others, are to be denied communion, and be sent back: bishops also are forbidden to ordain the subjects of other bishops without their consent. The seventeenth requires the deposition of all clergymen who lend money or goods on interest. By the eighteenth, deacons are forbidden to present the bread and wine to the presbyters, or to taste them before the bishop, or to sit among the presbyters. By the nineteenth, the followers of Paul of Samosata, on returning to the church, are to be re-baptized; and to be re-ordained, before they can officiate as clergymen. The twentieth disapproves of kneeling at prayers on the Lord's day, and from Easter to Pentecost. *Tr.]*

¹ [The synodic epistle, preserved by Socrates, *H. E.* i. 9, and by Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 9, acquaints us with the principal transactions of the council, and also shows the spirit of that venerable body. It is as follows: 'To the great and holy, by the grace of God, the church of the Alexandrians; and to the beloved brethren of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; the bishops assembled at Nice, and composing the great and holy synod, send greeting in the Lord.

'Forasmuch as, by the grace of God, the most pious emperor Constantine having called us together from various cities and provinces, a great and holy synod is assembled at Nice; it seemed altogether necessary that an epistle be sent to you in the name of the sacred synod, that you may have means of knowing what things have been moved, and examined, and what have been sanctioned. First of all, then, an inquiry was made, in the presence of the most pious emperor Constantine, into the impiety and iniquity of Arius and his associates; and it was determined by the

to correct the faults of others, they narrowly escaped falling into a great one themselves. For they were on the point of imposing celibacy on the clergy by an express law; but the act was prevented by *Paphnutius*, who had himself lived all his days in celibacy.¹

voice of all, that his impious doctrine is to be anathematized, as also the blasphemous words and terms he used, he having blasphemously said that *the Son of God was from nothing, and there was a time when he was not*; and saying, that *the Son of God, by the arbitrement of his will, is capable either of virtue or vice*; and pronouncing him *a creature and a work*: all which the holy synod hath anathematized, not enduring so much as to hear this impious doctrine, or rather madness, and these blasphemous words. What was the issue of the proceedings against him, ye have heard already, or will hear; lest we should seem to insult over a man who has received the deserved recompense of his wickedness. But his impiety prevailed so far as to involve in destruction with him Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais: for they received the same sentence. After the grace of God had delivered us from that evil doctrine, and impiety, and blasphemy, and from the persons who dared to raise discord and division among a once peaceable people, there yet remained the rashness of Meletius and of those ordained by him. And what the synod decreed on this subject, beloved brethren, we now inform you. It was determined that Meletius (whom the synod treated with more lenity; for, according to the strictness of law, he deserved no indulgence) should remain in his own city; but should have no authority, either to ordain, to nominate for office, or be seen in any other city or place on such business; but should only possess the naked title of honour. As for those raised to office by him, after being confirmed by a more solid consecration, fellowship is to be given them; yet on the condition, that they so hold their office and ministry, as always to take rank after all in every diocese or church, who were examined and ordained previously by our dearest colleague Alexander; and, moreover, have no authority to elect or to nominate such persons as they like, or indeed to do anything without the consent of some bishop of the catholic church who is Alexander's suffragan. But those who, by the grace of God and by your prayers, have never been found in any schism, but have remained blameless in the catholic church, shall have power to nominate and elect such as are worthy of the sacred office, and, in general, to do everything that accords with law and ecclesiastical usage. And if it happen that any of those now [bishops] in the church should be

removed by death, then let those lately admitted be advanced to the honours of the deceased; provided always, that they appear deserving, and the people choose them, and that the bishop of Alexandria concur in the election and confirm it. And this privilege is conceded to all others; but not so in regard to Meletius personally, to whom, on account of his former irregularity and his headlong rashness of temper, it is judged, no power or authority should be given, he being capable of again exciting the same disorders. And these are the things which relate particularly and especially to Egypt, and to the most holy church of Alexandria. But if any other canon or decree shall be made, as our lord and most precious fellow-minister and brother is present with us, when he shall arrive he will give you a more exact account, for he will have been an actor and co-operator in the things done. We also announce to you the harmony there is in regard to the most holy paschal feast; that this matter is happily settled, through the assistance of your prayers, so that all the brethren in the East, who before kept the festival with the Jews, will hereafter keep it in harmony with the Romans, with us, and with all those who, from ancient times, have kept it with us. Therefore, rejoicing in the happy issue of affairs, and the peaceful harmony that exists, and that all heresy is extirpated, do ye receive, with greater honour and more ardent love, our fellow-minister and your bishop, Alexander, who has gladdened us with his presence, encountering so great labour in his advanced age, that peace might be restored among you. And pray for us all, that whatever has been well determined upon, may remain stedfast, through our Lord Jesus Christ, being done, as we trust, according to the good pleasure of God the Father, in the Holy Spirit; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.' *Tr.—The simple humanity of Christ*, to use a phrase in favour with Unitarians, as they call themselves, appears never to have been mentioned at Nice: a strong presumption against modern claims of primitive antiquity for that opinion. Upon this and similar questions, see *Ante-Nicene Testimonies to the Divinity of Christ*, and also to the *Doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost*, two invaluable works of the late learned and amiable Dr. Edward Burton, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. S.]

¹ Socrates, *H. E.* i. 11; compare Fran.

§ 13. But the passions of men had a force too great for either the decrees of the Nicene council or the imperial authority. There were, accordingly, those who, though they did not otherwise agree with *Arius*, yet were dissatisfied with some things in the decrees and formularies of the council;¹ and the *Arians* left no means untried to heal the wound inflicted on them by these means. Nor did fortune refuse favour to their wishes; for in a few years after the Nicene council, a certain Arian priest, whom *Constantia*, the emperor's sister, at her death had recommended to the care of her brother, succeeded in persuading *Constantine* the Great, that *Arius* had been wrongfully condemned from personal enmity. Hence, in the year 330, the emperor recalled him from exile, rescinded the decrees passed against his associates and friends, and permitted *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, the principal supporter of Arius, and his powerful faction, now thirsting for revenge, to persecute the defenders of the Nicene council.² They assailed no one more fiercely than *Athanasius*, the

Baldwin's *Constantinus Magnus*, p. 76, and Geor. Calixtus, *de Conjugio Cleric.* p. 170, &c. [Paphnutius, a bishop in the upper Thebaid, himself the inmate of a monastery from boyhood, and renowned for chastity, took, after all, a narrow view of the question; such a one, in fact, as was to be expected from a considerate but prejudiced old man. He declared intercourse with a lawful wife to be chastity, and deprecated the separation of married persons, when the man took orders, as a yoke likely to injure the church, because all could not bear it. But then he denied all discretion as to marriage after ordination. The bachelor priest was to remain so, and the widower was not to marry again. These restrictions, he said, were according to the ancient tradition of the Church. This famous case, therefore, although evidence against Romish usage, responds but imperfectly to Protestant views. *S.*]

¹ [The word *ὁμοούσιος* (of the same essence), in particular. At first, seventeen bishops hesitated to subscribe the creed and the condemnation of Arius, because they wished to shun the appearance of favouring the Sabellian error; and objected, that the word *ὁμοούσιος* had been disapproved of in the time of Paul of Samosata. (Socrates, *H. E.* i. 8, 23, &c. Basil, *Ep.* 360.) And, in fact, Paul of Samosata had abused the word *ὁμοούσιος*, to controvert any other distinction between the Son, or Word, and the Father, except the difference of names and of external relations. And though it be not fully proved, that this term, in the Samosatian sense of it, was rejected by a council at Antioch in 269 (which decision at Antioch is pronounced fabulous, by Dr. Feuerlein, in his Dissert. on the question, *Dei filium patri esse ὁμοούσιος antiqui*

ecclesiæ doctores in concilio Antiocheno utrum negaverint? Gotting. 1755), yet it is certain, that the Arians had before alleged this Antiochian decree, and no one had charged them with mistake in so doing. Nevertheless, those who were not pleased with the creed were generally brought to acquiesce in it, partly by the threats of the emperor, to banish all who would not subscribe, and partly by the advice of the princess *Constantia*. Only Arius, with the bishops Theonas and Secundus, persevered in a refusal. Yet some [namely, *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, and Theognis, bishop of Nice] subscribed only the creed itself, and not also the anathema. *Schl.*]

² [So sudden a change was not to be expected. The council of Nice had taken every precaution to prevent the further spread of Arianism; and its decrees had been approved by other councils in distant provinces, and thus had obtained the authority of decrees by the whole church. The emperor had superadded to the sentence of the bishops, civil penalties, ordering the recusants into exile; and had condemned the writings of Arius to the flames, and commanded them to be delivered up on pain of death. [See the emperor's letter to the bishops and people, in Socrates, *H. E.* i. 9.] Thus the Arian party seemed to be wholly suppressed. But it only seemed to be so. Four years after, the atmosphere about the court of *Constantine* at once became clear and serene to the Arians; and the causes of so great a change are not well known; for the history of *Constantine* here has a chasm of three years. The princess *Constantia* seems actually to have had a hand in this great revolution. The bishops who were favourably disposed towards Arius, had recommended themselves to her, by

bishop of Alexandria. When this prelate could in no way be brought to restore *Arius* to his former honours and ecclesiastical standing, he was first deprived of his office in a council held at Tyre, A. D. 335, and then banished to Gaul; while in the same year, by a numerous council held at Jerusalem, *Arius* and his friends were solemnly admitted to the communion of the church. But by none of these proceedings could the Alexandrians be induced to receive *Arius* among their presbyters. Accordingly the emperor called him to Constantinople, in the year 336, and ordered *Alexander*, the bishop of that city, to open the doors of his church to him. But before that could take place, *Arius* died at Constantinople, in a tragical manner.¹ And the emperor himself closed life shortly after.

giving back in the Nicene council, and subscribing the creed, very much in compliance with her recommendation. (Philostorgius, *H. E.* i. c. 9.) This attention shown her would naturally pave the way for them to the confidence of the princess. And therefore the statement of Socrates (i. 25) and Sozomen (iii. 19) is not improbable; namely, that it was by her, and by an Arian priest whom she at her death recommended to him, that Constantine was brought to entertain more favourable views of the Arians. At the instigation of this priest, the emperor despatched a gracious letter to Arius, bidding him come to the court. Arius hastened to Constantinople, with his friend Euzoius, and was graciously listened to by the emperor, whom he satisfied as to his orthodoxy. At the requisition of the emperor, they both presented a confession of their faith, which was so artfully drawn up, as to conceal their real sentiments under orthodox phraseology. In this way, Arius obtained permission to return to Alexandria. Before this, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis, bishop of Nice, had been reinstated in their offices; and the former now commenced persecuting the orthodox party, and especially Athanasius. The deposition of Athanasius was decreed by the council of Tyre; but his banishment was by order of the emperor, before whom he was accused of threatening to prevent the exportation of grain from Egypt to Constantinople. As Arius met with more opposition at Alexandria than he expected, and as his presence there caused commotions which seemed almost to amount to an insurrection, he was called back to Constantinople. Here he had another hearing before the emperor, and swore to a formula of faith presented by himself, which sounded very orthodox. The emperor was so well satisfied by this exhibition of Arius, that he sent for Alexander, the bishop of Constantinople, and earnestly enjoined upon him to admit Arius the next Sunday to his communion. The terrified bishop retired

to the church of St. Irene, and there prayed that the calamity might be averted. On the day appointed, Arius, accompanied by Eusebius of Nicomedia and others of his adherents, proceeded through the principal streets of the city, in order to enter the church in triumph, and entertained his friends with playful discourse. But as he passed along, the calls of nature obliged him to step aside. He entered one of the public offices erected for such purposes, and left his servants waiting at the door; and here he died with a violent colic. See Walch's *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 486, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ Some of the moderns are disposed to call in question this account of Arius' death; but without good reason, since it is attested by such unexceptionable witnesses as Socrates, Sozomen, Athanasius, and others. Yet the cause of his sudden and extraordinary death—for the miserable man is said to have discharged his own bowels—is a subject of much controversy. The ancients, who tell us that God, being moved by the prayers of holy men, miraculously avenged the wickedness of the man, will hardly find credit at this day among candid persons well acquainted with Arian affairs. When I consider all the circumstances of the case, I confess, that to me it appears most probable, the unhappy man lost his life by the machinations of his enemies, being destroyed by poison. An indiscreet and blind zeal in religion has, in every age, led on to many crimes worse than this. [The preceding account of Arius' death, and of the circumstances attending it, is given by Athanasius (*Ep. ad Scrapion. de morte Arii*, p. 522, &c. *Opp.* tom. ii. ed. Commelin), by Socrates (*H. E.* i. 37, 38), Sozomen (*H. E.* ii. 29, 30), by Theodoret (*H. E.* i. 15), and by several other writers of the fourth century. Most of them regard it as a miracle, by which God punished him for his perjury, or hearkened to the prayers of bishop Alexander, who, with others, returned thanks to God for this deliverance. Some moderns questioned, whether this whole narration may not

§ 14. After the death of *Constantine* the Great, one of his sons, *Constantius*, the emperor of the East, with his wife and his court, was very partial to the Arian cause; but *Constantine* and *Constans* supported, in the western parts, where they governed, the decisions of the Nicene council. Hence the broils, the commotions, the plots, the injuries, had neither measure nor bounds, and on both sides councils were assembled to oppose councils. *Constans* died in the year 350; and two years after a great part of the West, particularly Italy and Rome, came under the dominion of his brother *Constantius*; and this revolution was most disastrous to the friends of the Nicene council. For this emperor, being devoted to the Arians, involved them in numerous evils and calamities, and by threats and punishments compelled many of them, and among others, as is well attested, the Roman pontiff, *Liberius*, to apostatise to that sect to which he was himself attached.¹ The Nicene party made no hesitation to return the same treatment, as soon as time, place, and opportunity were afforded them. And the history of Christianity under *Constantius* presents the picture of a most stormy period, and of a war among brethren, which was carried on without religion, or justice, or humanity.²

§ 15. On the death of *Constantius* in the year 361, the prosperous days of the Arians were at an end. *Julian* had no partialities for either, and therefore patronised neither the Arians nor the orthodox.³

be a fabrication. Yet the story is told with such uniformity as to the principal facts by those who differ in the minor circumstances of it, and the spot where he died was so generally pointed out, even in the fifth century, according to Socrates, that we are not authorised to doubt the truth of the general statement. Yet it can by no means be proved, or indeed be made to appear probable, that the sudden death of Arius was miraculous, and a punishment inflicted by God. Sozomen himself tells us, that some at the time regarded it as the consequence of a disease, which directly affected the heart; others believed, that his sudden joy at finding his affairs issuing so happily, brought on him this speedy death. Very much is requisite to justify the ascription of an event which may be explained by natural causes, to supernatural, and to the hand of God inflicting a divine punishment. But under such circumstances, Christians have in all ages been too ready to make up such inconsiderate judgments. Besides, the death of Arius is painted as being as extraordinary as possible; and is not obscurely compared, by Athanasius in particular, with that of Judas the traitor; and on the other hand, the strange prayer of bishop Alexander against him, is not only passed without censure, but is represented as being a holy prayer which heaven answered. The adherents of Arius maintained, that his enemies compassed his death by magical arts: and in very recent

times, discerning writers have conjectured that he was poisoned. This, however, is merely a conjecture, and one which is often made on occasion of the sudden and unexpected death of persons who had many or powerful enemies. Nothing more, therefore, can be regarded as certain, but this: Arius died a sudden death; but the cause of it is unknown. Taken from Schroeckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, v. 386, 387. *Tr.*

¹ [It appears from the Letters of Liberius, which are still extant, and from Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, and others, that Liberius boldly resisted the Arians, and was therefore banished to Berea in Thrace; that, at the end of two years, his eagerness to return to his bishopric led him to consent to the condemnation of Athanasius, and to subscribe the Arian creed set forth by the third council of Sirmium. This weakness in a pope has furnished the Protestants with an argument against the papal infallibility. See, among others, Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, i. 136, &c. *Tr.*]

² [For proof the reader is referred to Athanasius, *Apolog. ad Constant.* p. 307, &c. *Historia Arianor. ad Monach.* p. 373, &c. 393, &c. Sozomen, *H. E.* iv. 9, 19. Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 37, and the dark picture of the state of the church, by Vincentius Lirinensis, in his *Commonit.* c. 6. *Schl.*]

³ [Julian, who wished to make himself popular, and to ruin the Christian church by its internal contests, gave all sects of

*Jovian*¹ espoused the orthodox sentiments: and therefore all the West, with no small part of the East, rejecting Arian views, reverted to the doctrines of the Nicene council.² But the scene was changed under the two brothers, *Valentinian* and *Valens*, who were advanced to the government of the empire in the year 364. *Valentinian* adhered to the decisions at Nice; and therefore, in the West, the Arian sect, a few churches excepted, was wholly extirpated. *Valens*, on the contrary, took sides with the Arians; and hence, in the eastern provinces, many calamities befell the orthodox.³ But when this emperor had fallen in a war with the Goths, A. D. 378, *Gratian* restored peace to the orthodox.⁴ After him *Theodosius* the Great,⁵ by depriving the Arians of all their churches, and enacting severe laws against them,⁶ caused the decisions of the Nicene council to triumph everywhere, and none could any longer publicly profess Arian doctrines, except among the barbarous nations, Goths,⁷ Vandals,⁸

Christians entire liberty of conscience, and recalled all the banished. And this was greatly for the advantage of the orthodox, especially in the West, where the churches again recovered their bishops, and such of them as had renounced orthodoxy through fear returned again to the profession of it. *Schl.*]

¹ [A. D. 363, 364. *Tr.*]

² [The Arians in the East took great pains to draw *Jovian* over to their side; but as these attempts proved fruitless, several of them, and in particular *Acacius*, were induced to yield assent to the Nicene creed. The Arians of Alexandria also in vain laboured to bring *Athanasius* into disgrace; and he was in high favour till the emperor's death. *Schl.*]

³ [The persecutions of *Valens* extended also to the Semi-Arians, and other minor parties: and the Semi-Arians, after much negotiation, resorted to the unexpected measure of sending messengers to Rome, and by subscribing the Nicene creed, attempted to form a coalition with the western Christians. But this was frustrated, partly by the repugnance of some of the Semi-Arians to the word *μοούσιος*, and partly by the exertions of the powerful Arians at court; and a new persecution ensued. The orthodox ventured to make a representation to the emperor *Valens*, and for this purpose sent a delegation, composed of eighty clergymen, to *Nicomedia*. The emperor cruelly ordered *Modestus*, the prætorian prefect, to put them all to death, but without noise; which he accomplished by putting them on board a vessel, and, when at sea, causing the vessel and all the unhappy men to be burnt. Such cruelty, perhaps, is without a parallel among the persecutions by the pagans. *Socrates*, *H. E.* iv. 15. *Sozomen*, *H. E.* vi. 13. *Theodoret*, *H. E.* iv. 21, and *Walch*, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 543, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ [*Gratian* granted religious freedom to

all his subjects at the commencement of his reign, and excluded only the Manichæans, the Photinians, and the Eunomians from the liberty of holding assemblies for worship. He also recalled all the bishops whom *Valens* had banished. Some of the Semi-Arians now again held their own synods, and renewed their confession of faith, that the Son is of *like essence* [*ὁμοούσιος*] with the Father, in a council held at Antioch in Syria. On the other hand, the orthodox again set up public worship in Constantinople, and obtained the zealous Gregory Nazianzen for their bishop. *Gratian*, at length, forbade the assemblies of the heretics, without distinction. *Codex Theodos.* l. v. *de Hæret.* and the Notes of Godefroi, vi. 128. *Walch*, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 547, &c. *Schl.*]

⁵ [A. D. 383—395. *Tr.*]

⁶ See *Codex Theodos.* vi. 5, 10, 130, 146, and Godefroi, Notes on these laws. [*Walch*, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 549, &c. *Schl.*]

⁷ [The Goths were on this occasion entangled in the Arian heresy. Being driven by the Huns from their former residence on the Tanais, they sent an embassy to the emperor *Valens*, and obtained liberty to plant themselves on the banks of the Danube; promising to serve the Romans in their wars, and to embrace the Christian religion, as soon as teachers should be sent among them. *Ulphilas* was one of their ambassadors, who was himself an Arian, and *Valens* gave him only Arian teachers for his assistants. It was not strange, therefore, that the Arian doctrine obtained so great currency among this people. The subsequent history of Arianism among them, is related by *Walch*, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 553. *Schl.*]

⁸ [Neither the time nor the circumstances in which this people embraced Christianity, can be ascertained. They were Christians before they came into France. (*Salvianus*, *de Ira Dei*, lib. vii. p. 845 and 228.) From

and Burgundians.¹ That there were great faults on both sides, in this long and violent contest, no candid person can deny; but which party was the heavier offender, it is difficult to say.²

§ 16. The Arians would have done much more harm to the church, if they had not become divided among themselves, after the Nicene council, and split into sects which could not endure each other. The ancients enumerate as Arian sects, the *Semi-Arians*, the *Eusebians*,³ the *Ætians*, the *Eunomians*, the *Acacians*,⁴ the *Psathyrians*,⁵ and others. But they may all be reduced to three classes. The first class embraces the old and *genuine Arians*; who, rejecting all new terms and modes of expression, taught explicitly, that the Son was *not begotten* by the Father, but *created* or formed out of nothing.⁶

a passage in Jornandes (*de Rebus Geticis*, c. 25), it is probable that they got their first knowledge of Christianity from their neighbours the Goths, and according to the Arian principles. They were persecutors of the orthodox; which cannot be said of the Goths. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 559, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ [The Burgundians became Christians, and orthodox, soon after their settlement in Gaul in the fifth century. Orosius, lib. viii. c. 32, and the history of the fifth century, *infra*, pt. i. chap. i. § 4. But their intercourse with the West Goths infected them with Arianism. Yet under the successors of their king Gundebold, the orthodox doctrine again got the upper hand; and under the domination of the Franks, the Arian principles were wholly rooted out. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 564, &c. *Schl.*]

² [The judgment pronounced by Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 698, is so sound and impartial, that I cannot refrain from inserting it here without alteration. 'The modern Arians in England blacken the character of Athanasius too much, in order to discredit his doctrine; other writers, too much prepossessed with the idea that a Calendar saint must be an angel, represent this man and his adherents as absolutely faultless. If we would judge impartially, both parties were chargeable with the dreadful consequences of this contest. There was a total want of moderation throughout: everywhere the mistaken notion reigned, that it is right to exercise control over the consciences of others; everywhere private matters were treated as public affairs of the church; everywhere the authority of ecclesiastical councils was misused; and still more, that of civil magistrates; everywhere, therefore, a persecuting spirit was cherished and maintained. In particular, we believe, that these faults commenced on the side of the orthodox; that other bishops too hastily became linked in with Alexander; and that in the council of Sardica, too little respect was paid to the wishes of the oriental

bishops, in respect to Athanasius, which were, that he might not sit and vote in the council, because he was the accused person. But the Arians were guilty of still greater offences. Arius was in fault, for so zealously endeavouring to create a party; but Eusebius of Nicomedia was, in our opinion, a real firebrand, who set the whole in a flame; and the suspicion, that pride and love of distinction led him to defend Arius, and produced that obstinacy in supporting the side he took, appears to us well-founded. In short, this history very forcibly inculcates the necessity of uniting true benevolence to men with our zeal for the truth, and the avoiding of all personal animosities, by presenting to us so many lamentable occurrences and so very unhappy consequences, arising from the neglect of these Christian duties,' Walch, *ubi supra*. *Schl.*]

³ [These derived their name from Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Eusebius of Nicomedia, afterwards of Constantinople, the friend of Constantine the Great. These belonged to the class of *Semi-Arians*; called, at this day, *Subordinationists*, because they maintained a *subordination* among the persons of the Godhead. Yet this name was applied to all who opposed the Nicene doctrine, and who disapproved either of the word *homoeousios* only, or of the idea also which it was used to express. *Schl.*]

⁴ [From Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea, and successor of Eusebius Pamphili. He allowed that the Son was like the Father; but only in respect to his *will*. *Schl.*]

⁵ [This word imports *pastry-cooks*; because a person of this occupation, a Syrian named Theoctistus, was particularly zealous in defending one of the minor parties of Arians in Constantinople, which maintained that God the Father existed before the Son had a being. *Schl.*]

⁶ [Arius maintained, there were *three* substances in God, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The *first* is the only eternal God. There is, absolutely, none like him; and his essence is incomprehensible.

From these deviated, on the one side, the *Semi-Arians*; and on the other, the *Eunomians* or *Anomæans*, that is, the disciples of *Eunomius*, a man of acuteness, and of *Aëtius*. The former maintained, that the Son of God was *ὁμοούσιος*, i. e. of *like essence* with the Father; yet not by nature, but only by grace. The leaders of this party were *George* of Laodicea, and *Basil* of Ancyra.¹ The latter, who were also called pure Arians, *Aëtians*,² and *Euxontians*,³ contended that Christ was *ἐτεροούσιος* or *ἕτεροιος*, i. e. *dissimilar*, both in *essence* and in other respects, to the Father.⁴ Under each of these classes there were other subordinate sects, whose subtleties and refinements have been

He is called the *Father*, in a sense corresponding with that in which the Son is called the *Son*; and as the latter was not always the Son, so the former was not always the Father. The *second* substance is the person who is denominated in the Scriptures, the Son, the Word, and the Wisdom of God. He is absolutely a *creature* of God; and one whom God created, as he did the other creatures, immediately from nothing. This creation of the Son, the Scriptures denominate a *generation*; and this creature is called the *Son* of God, in a figurative sense of the word, because God has *adopted* him. The terms *Word* and *Wisdom* of God are ambiguous; for they sometimes denote certain powers or attributes of God, and sometimes a person, namely, the Son. In the former acceptation, they are inherent in God, naturally and necessarily: but not so in the latter. God, of his voluntary choice, produced this person, to be an instrument in his hand in the creation of the world. The Son, therefore, is, in his essence, totally different from the Father. As a rational creature, he possesses free will, is changeable, and so might become either vicious or virtuous; though, by his diligence and his long practice, he has acquired permanent habits of virtue. And God has chosen for his Son, the most virtuous of all created spirits. Thus the Son, according to Arius' views, is not truly God, not eternal, not omniscient. There are, to his understanding, some mysteries; and he does not comprehend clearly the essence of the Father, nor his own nature. Yet God has graciously imparted to him pre-eminent gifts. Thereby he is become the Son of God; nay, obtained for himself the name of *God*; though not in the proper sense of the word. Such is Dr. Walch's representation of the doctrine of Arius; in his *Hist. Ketz.* ii. 589, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ See Prud. Maran, *Dissert. sur les Semi-Ariens*; which has been reprinted by Joh. Voigt, in *Biblioth. Hæresiolog.* ii. 119, &c. [The Semi-Arians were also called *moderate Arians*, *Eusebians*, and *Homœousians*, from the word *ὁμοούσιος*, which was their symbol. George of Laodicea was a native of Alexandria, and a very learned man. He had

personal difficulties with bishop Alexander, and obtained the bishopric of Laodicea, through the Eusebian party, to which he devoted himself. Basil, bishop of Ancyra, had the reputation of an upright and learned man, and was in great favour with the emperor Constantius. He can be taxed with no other fault, than that of not tolerating the word *ὁμοούσιος*. He drew on himself much persecution by his zealous opposition to Photinus and to the genuine Arians; and was deprived of his office by the Aca-cians. *Schl.*]

² [From their chief person, Aëtius of Antioch. This man applied himself to the sciences at Alexandria, and acquainted himself with the medical art, as well as with theology. As all his instructors were of Arian sentiments, he also applied his talents and his dexterity in debate to the vindication of the Arian doctrines. He was made a deacon at Antioch; but the Semi-Arians and the orthodox hated him, and he was deposed and banished in the reign of Constantius. Julian recalled him, and gave him a bishopric. He had the surname of the *Atheist*. Socrates, *H. E.* i. 35. Sozomen, *H. E.* iii. 15, &c. and iv. 23. *Schl.*]

³ [This name is derived from the Greek words *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*. They said, that the Son of God might indeed be called *God*, and the *Word of God*; but only in a sense consistent with his having been brought forth *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων* [*from non-existences*]; that is, that he was one of those things which *once had no existence*; and, of course, that he was properly a *creature*, and was once a *nonentity*. *Schl.*]

⁴ See Ja. Basnage, *Diss. de Eunomio*, in Henr. Canisius, *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. i. p. 172, &c. where are extant the creed and an apology of Eunomius. See also J. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Gr.* viii. 100—148; and *Coder Theodos.* vi. 147, 155, 157, 167, 200, &c. [Eunomius, a Cappadocian, was a scholar of Aëtius, and was made bishop of Cyzicus by his partisans. But he was soon displaced, and his whole life was full of unpleasant occurrences. He was peculiarly lucid in his style, and his writings are, on that account, the most valuable docu-

but obscurely developed by the ancient writers. This discord among the Arians was as injurious to their cause as the confutations and the zeal of the orthodox.

§ 17. Unhappily the Arian contests produced, as was very natural, some new sects. Some persons, eager to avoid and overthrow the opinions of *Arius*, fell into opinions equally dangerous. Others, after treading in the footsteps of *Arius*, ventured on far beyond him, and exceeded his offences. The human mind, weak, powerless, and subject to the control of the senses and the imagination, seldom exerts all its energies to comprehend divine subjects, in such a manner as to be duly guarded against extremes. To the former class I would refer *Apollinaris* the younger, bishop of Laodicea, though otherwise a man of great merit, and one who in various ways rendered important service to the church.¹ He manfully asserted the divinity of *Christ*, against the Arians; but by philosophizing too freely and too eagerly, he almost set aside his humanity. He maintained that *Christ* assumed only a human body, endowed with a sentient soul, but not possessed of intellect; and that the divine nature in *Christ* did the office of a rational soul or mind:² whence it seemed to follow, that the divine nature became mingled with the human,³ and with the human nature suffered pain and death. This great man was led astray, not merely by the ardour of debate, but likewise by his immoderate attachment to the Platonic doctrine concerning a twofold soul; from which if the divines of that age had been free, they would have formed more wise and more correct judgments on many points. Some among the ancients note other errors besides this in *Apollinaris*, but how much credit is due to them may be doubted.⁴ The doctrine of *Apollinaris* met the appro-

ments for the history of Arianism. *Schl.*—See note, cent. iv. pt. ii. c. 2, § 9. *Tr.*]

¹ [See note, cent. iv. pt. ii. c. 2, § 9. *Tr.*]

² [*Apollinaris* believed that *Christ* had no need of a rational soul, because the divine nature was competent to all the rational and free acts which the Saviour performed; and he could see no reason why *Christ* must have had *two* intelligent natures and two free wills. He supposed further, that a rational human soul, as it was the seat of sinful acts, was liable to moral changes; and therefore *Christ*, if he had possessed a rational human soul, could not have had an unchangeable, that is, a sinless, human nature. And he supported his opinion by the many passages of Scripture which speak of *Christ's* becoming man, in which only the word *σὰρξ*, *flesh*, is used for the human nature; e. g. John i. 14. These arguments needed an answer; but his opposers replied to them very imperfectly. They showed, indeed, from the Bible, that *Christ* had a rational human soul. But their proof was defective in this, that they did not show, that by the word *ψυχή*, in the Scriptures, must necessarily be understood a *rational*

soul. And what they brought forward besides this, were either the bad consequences that would follow, or occasions for logomachy, which rather retarded than furthered the discovery of truth. See *Walch, Hist. Ketz.* iii. 186, &c. *Schl.*]

³ [This consequence, however, *Apollinaris* did not admit. He was indeed accused of denying the actual distinction of the two natures, and of holding to such a confusion of them, as *Eutyches* afterwards maintained. But he rejected the term *mixture*; and expressly taught, that he did not subvert the doctrine of two distinct natures in *Christ*, but that the divinity remained divine, and the flesh remained flesh. See *Walch, Hist. Ketz.* iii. 193, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ See *J. Basnage, Historia Hæresis Apollinaris*; which is republished with some learned additions, by *Jo. Voigt, Biblioth. Hæresiologicala*, tom. i. fascic. i. p. 1—96. See also *ibid.* tom. i. fascic. iii. p. 607. The laws against the *Apollinarians* are extant in the *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 144, &c. See likewise (*Chaufepied*) *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. et Crit.* tom. i. p. 294, &c. [*Walch, Hist. Ketz.* iii. 119—229. *Schl.*]

bation of many, in nearly all the eastern provinces; and being explained in different ways, it became the source of new sects. But as it was assailed by the laws of the emperors, the decrees of councils, and the writings of learned men, it gradually sank under these united assaults.

§ 18. In the same class must be reckoned *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia;¹ if confidence may be placed in *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, and in his other adversaries, who tell us, that he so explained the mystery of the holy Trinity, as to fall into the Sabellian and Samosatene errors. Yet there are many who think that both *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, and *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, unfairly represent his sentiments, because he gave offence by the severity of his attacks upon the Arians and upon the bishops who favoured them. But admitting that his accusers were influenced in some respects by their hatred of the man, yet it is certain that their accusations were not altogether groundless. For it appears, from a careful examination of the whole subject, that *Marcellus* considered the Son and the Holy Spirit as two *emanations* from the divine nature, which, after performing their respective offices, were to return back into the substance of the Father: and whoever believed so, could not, without self-contradiction, hold the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to differ from each other in the manner of distinct persons.² *Marcellus* increased the odium and suspicions against him

¹ [Marcellus in the Nicene council opposed the Arians with a zeal and energy which procured him praise from his own party, and hatred and obloquy from the opposite side. (See Epiphanius, *Heres.* lxxii. c. 2. Athanas. *Apolog. contra Arian.* tom. i. pt. ii. p. 135, 150, and Constant, *Epist. Pontiff.* p. 379, 383.) Asterius, an Arian, attacked him in writing, and accused him of Sabellianism. Marcellus in reply wrote a book to defend the true doctrine respecting the subordination of Jesus Christ to the Father. In 336, the Arian bishops assembled at Constantinople deposed him, as a Sabellian or Samosatene, and elected Basil in his place. After the death of Constantius, he recovered his see; but lost it again almost immediately, as the Eusebians again got the ascendancy. He now fled to Rome, and exhibited a confession of his faith to the bishop Julius, by whom, with the other bishops of the Athanasian party assembled at Rome, he was recognised as orthodox, and as a sufferer for the truth. On the other hand, the eastern bishops persevered in their criminations of him. In 347, the western bishops at the council of Sardica again pronounced him innocent. But when Photinus, a pupil of Marcellus, commenced his disturbance, Athanasius threw out some suspicions, that his doctrine was not pure; but soon dropped them. Basil the Great was more decided

in his opposition to Marcellus, and held him to be actually a heretic. Yet he afterwards acknowledged himself in the wrong. Marcellus and his friends took pains to procure testimony, from influential men and from churches, to their orthodoxy; and they were not unsuccessful. Marcellus was, in reality, not without considerable learning; but his judgment was weak, and he had the habit of talking at random, and was at the same time very bitter against his antagonists. It is, therefore, very probable, that he often let drop faulty expressions, which in the view of his enemies contained dangerous errors. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 232, &c. *Schl.*]

² [It is nevertheless uncertain, whether Marcellus really denied the personal distinctions in the Trinity. The accusations of his opposers are not credible evidence in this case. Marcellus and his friends constantly denied that they were Sabellians. He denied, indeed, that there were three *ὑποστάσεις*, affirming that there was but one *ὑπόστασις*. But this word had then so indeterminate a meaning, that nothing certain can be inferred from it. For it denoted, sometimes, what we should call *substance*; and at other times was equivalent to *person*. Dr. Walch, *ubi supra*, p. 290, thinks it probable, as Marcellus always strenuously contended, and with justice, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are *ἀδιασπέρως* and

by refusing, in the last years of his life, to condemn *Photinus*, his disciple.¹

§ 19. At the head of those whom the contests with *Arius* led into still greater errors, may undoubtedly be placed *Photinus*, bishop of Sirmium,² who, in the year 343, advanced opinions concerning God, equally remote from those of the orthodox and those of the Arians. On well considering what the ancients have stated without much perspicuity or uniformity, it appears, that he supposed *Jesus Christ* to have been born of the virgin *Mary* by the Holy Spirit; that with this extraordinary man, a certain divine *emanation*, which he called the *Word*, became united; that, on account of this union of the *Word* with the man *Jesus*, he was called the *Son of God*, and also *God*; and that the Holy Spirit was a virtue or *energy*, proceeding from God, and not a *person*.³ The temerity of the man was chastised, not only by the orthodox, in their councils of Antioch, A.D. 345, of Milan, A.D. 347, and of Sirmium⁴ [357 and 359, by Semi-Arians], but also by the Arians, in a

ἀχωρίτως (*inseparably*) united, he must have regarded the word *ὑπόστασις* as equivalent to the phrase *ὑπόστασις διεστῶσα*, a *different substance*. Yet clearly he often used unsuitable descriptions and comparisons respecting the eternal generation of the Son, and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son; and such as seem to show, that he understood by these persons only certain attributes and acts of God. But perhaps these were only unfortunate expressions, or errors of the moment, from which he would give back, when the heat of contest subsided. *Schl.*]

¹ See Bernh. de Montfaucon, *Diatribæ de causâ Marcelli*; in the *Nova Collectio Patrum Græcor.* ii. 51, &c. [republished with notes, by Voigt, *Biblioth. Hæresiol.* vol. i. fascic. ii. p. 297. *Schl.*] and Ja. Gervaise, *Vie de S. Epiphane*, p. 42, &c. [Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 229—299, and Chr. Hen. Vogel's Disputation at Göttingen, 1757, *de Marcello Ancyra Episcopo.* *Schl.*]

² [Photinus was not a native of Sirmium, as some have supposed, being misled by a faulty Latin version of a passage in Epiphanius, *de Hæres.* lxxi. § 1. He was a Galatian (Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 107; Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 18), and most probably of Ancyra. His writings are lost. He was eloquent, and had an excellent faculty of securing affection and making proselytes among his hearers. Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 9, &c. *Schl.*]

³ [Photinus had (I.) erroneous views of the *Trinity*. On this subject he taught thus:—The holy Scriptures speak indeed of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; but we are to understand by them, only *one person*, who in Scripture is called the Father. What the Scriptures call the *Word*

of God, is by no means a substance or a *person*. Still less is it a person *begotten* by the Father, and therefore called the Son. For with God there can be no generation; and of course he can have no Son. Neither is the Word *that person* who made the world; but the *Word* is properly the *understanding* of God; which comprehends the designs of God in all his external operations, and is therefore called God. The Holy Spirit also is not a *person*, but an attribute of God. Hence followed (II.) erroneous ideas of the *person of Christ*. He maintained, that Jesus Christ was a *mere man*; that before his birth he had no existence, except in the divine foreknowledge; and that he began to *be*, when he was born of Mary by the Holy Spirit. Yet he received the special influences of divine power, whereby he wrought miracles. This is the indwelling of the *Word*. On account of these excellent gifts, and his perfect virtue, God took this man into the place of a son; and therefore he is called the *Son of God*, and also *God*. Therefore it must be said, that the Son of God had a beginning. Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 34. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Concerning the time and succession of these councils, there has been much debate between Petavius, Sirmond, La Roque, and others: of which an account is given by Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 5, &c. We will add, in correction of Mosheim's statements, that the earliest of these councils was held in 343; as appears from three documents, first brought to light by Maffei [but Mosheim's dates are now generally received as true. *Ed.*]; and that it was held by the Semi-Arians. So that the first orthodox council against Photinus was that of Milan. In that of Sirmium, the eastern bishops were assembled; and they pronounced Photinus

council held at Sirmium, A.D. 351. He was deprived of his office, and died in exile, in the year 372.¹

§ 20. After him *Macedonius*, bishop of Constantinople, a distinguished Semi-Arian teacher, being deprived of his office, through the influence of the Eunomians, by the council of Constantinople, in the year 360,² founded in his exile the sect of the *Pneumatomachi*.

a heretic. Photinus, when adjudged to be deprived of his office and sent into exile, made application to the emperor, and obtained leave publicly to defend his doctrine. Basil, bishop of Ancyra, was appointed to dispute with him; but the victory was adjudged to Basil, and the former decision was affirmed. See Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 51, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ Matth. de la Roque, *de Photino, ejusque multiplici damnatione*, Geneva, 1670, 8vo. Tho. Ittig. *Historia Photini*, in his *Heptas Dissertationum*, subjoined to his *Diss. de Hæresiarchis Ævi Apostolici*. [Petavius, *Diss. de Photino hæretico, ejusque damnatione*; in his *Rationarium Temporum*, 3rd edit. and among the *Opuscula* of Peter de Marca [vol. v. p. 183, &c. ed. Bamberg, 1789; where it is accompanied with the two *Diatriba* of Sirmond, respecting the councils of Sirmium]; and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 1—70. *Schl.*]

² [There were several other persons of the name of Macedonius. The most noted were Macedonius of Mopsuestia, a contemporary with our Macedonius, and also involved in the Arian contests (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 19), and Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople in the reign of Anastasius [A.D. 491—518], by whom he was banished for his zeal against the Eutychians. The election of our Macedonius was attended with disorders which merit notice. This metropolis had one Paul for its bishop, who was deposed by Constantius, and Eusebius of Nicomedia chosen in his place. After the death of Eusebius, the orthodox replaced Paul in his office; but the Eusebian bishops appointed Macedonius. The emperor Constantius was displeased with the movement of the orthodox, and ordered his general, Hermogenes, to drive Paul from the city. And as his adherents made opposition, and the general had to use force, there was a general insurrection, which cost both sides much blood. The orthodox populace set fire to the general's house, and dragged him about the streets with a rope round his neck, and finally killed him. The emperor now came himself to Constantinople, drove Paul from the city, and punished the people. And he also refused to establish Macedonius in the office, because he had given occasion to the bloodshed; but he allowed him to remain in the city, and to hold worship in one of the churches which was assigned him. (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. c.

13, and Sozomen, *H. E.* iii. c. 8.) Paul returned again to Constantinople, and was again chased away by the soldiery: and on the other hand, Macedonius was, in the year 342, reinstated by an imperial general, which occasioned another massacre, in which more than 3,000 persons lost their lives. But as Constantius was compelled by his brother Constans to reinstate the orthodox bishops, Paul shared in this good fortune, and Macedonius with his adherents had to content themselves with a single church to worship in. After the death of Constans, Paul was again displaced, and Macedonius once more seated in the episcopal chair. Here, confiding in the protection of the emperor, he stirred up a general persecution against the adherents to the Nicene creed, which extended to the provinces adjacent to Constantinople. (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. c. 26, 27, 38, and Sozomen, *H. E.* iv. c. 20, 26.) In the year 356, that church at Constantinople in which was placed the coffin of Constantine the Great, seemed ready to fall down, and Macedonius therefore would remove the coffin. Some, including the orthodox party, maintained that this removal was improper and irregular, being influenced partly by respect for the deceased emperor, and partly by hatred against Macedonius. But as Macedonius, notwithstanding, had proceeded to the removal, and had brought the coffin into another church, the two parties came to blows in the latter church, and such a slaughter was there made, that the porch was filled with dead bodies. This unfortunate step drew upon Macedonius the emperor's displeasure. (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. c. 38. Sozomen, *H. E.* iv. c. 21.) About this time, the disagreement among the opposers of the Nicene faith came to an open rupture; and Basil of Ancyra, the leader of the Semi-Arians, drew Macedonius over to his party. (Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. c. 9.) From this time onward, Macedonius held a high rank among the Semi-Arians, and supported their cause in the council of Seleucia. But he thus drew on himself such hatred from the whole Arian party, that they in the year 360, with Acacius and Eudoxius at their head, deprived him of his office at Constantinople. Macedonius was very restless under this, and laboured to establish the Semi-Arians by defending their opinions, and this gave occasion for the Semi-Arians to be sometimes called *Macedonians*. He

For he now openly professed, what he had before concealed, that the *Holy Spirit* is a *divine energy* diffused throughout the universe, and not a *person* distinct from the Father and the Son.¹ This doctrine was embraced by many in the Asiatic provinces. But the council of Constantinople, assembled by *Theodosius* the Great, in the year 381, and which is commonly considered as the *second œcumenical council*, soon dissipated by its authority this sect, while yet but rising into notice. One hundred and fifty bishops, present in this council, defined fully and perfectly the doctrine of three persons in one God, which still is professed by the great body of Christians; a thing, by the Nicene council only done in part. They also anathematized all the heresies then known; assigned to the bishop of Constantinople, on account of the grandeur of the city over which he presided, a rank next after the bishop of Rome; and made such other regulations as the general interests of the church seemed to require.²

died soon afterwards. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* vol. iii. p. 74, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. iv. [For a more full exhibition of the Macedonian doctrines, we will subjoin the statement of Dr. Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 96. As to their doctrine concerning the *Son of God*, some Macedonians agreed with the adherents to the Nicene fathers; but others, and among them Macedonius himself, coincided with the mildest form of the Semi-Arian creed. In regard to the Holy Spirit, they departed wholly from the opinions of the orthodox. Some indeed did not declare themselves in regard to the divinity of the Holy Spirit. They did not expressly deny that he was God; and yet they hesitated to affirm it. And this was no unusual thing. Even Basil the Great would not recommend to have the name of God used in public of the Holy Spirit, nor condemn those who refused thus to use it. Nor would Gregory disapprove this. See Petavius, *Dogm. Theolog.* lib. i. de *Trinitate*, c. 10, tom. ii. p. 45, 64, and Semler, *Einleitung zum 3ten Theil der Baumgarten's Polemik*, p. 173, 183. Others who did declare themselves, affirmed that the Holy Spirit was not a *person* in the Godhead: that he was not what the Father and the Son are; and therefore no divine honours were due to him. Some held the Holy Spirit to be a creature; and therefore did not deny his personality. Others denied his personality, and regarded him as a mere attribute of God. *Schl.*—Whether or not the Macedonians explicitly denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit is uncertain; but they viewed him as essentially separate from, and external to, the one indivisible Godhead. Accordingly, the Creed (which is that since incorporated in the public services of the church), without declaring more than the occasion required, closes all speculations concerning the incomprehensible subject, by

simply confessing his *unity with the Father and Son*. It declares, moreover, that he is the *Lord*, or sovereign Spirit, because the heretics considered him to be but a minister of God; and the supreme *Giver* of life, because they considered him a mere instrument, by whom we received the gift. The last clause of the second paragraph in the Creed is directed against the heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra.' Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*, 420. S.]

² Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 8. Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 7. [The Macedonians led an externally good and strict life; and by promoting monkery, obtained such reputation for piety, agreeably to the taste of that age, as contributed much to their popularity in Constantinople and its vicinity. After their separation from the Arians, and after their attempt to unite themselves with the orthodox had failed, they spread considerably, especially in Thrace, along the Hellespont, and in Phrygia. In the western provinces they were not found. At Constantinople they had their own churches and bishops. Among the attempts to reclaim the Macedonians from their errors, the most noticeable was that of the second general council at Constantinople. The emperor Theodosius hoped they might be won over more readily than the Arians, because they differed less from the orthodox. He therefore called Macedonian bishops to the council. There were thirty-six of them present, and much pains was taken to persuade them to embrace the Nicene decisions. But all efforts were vain; they declared that they would sooner embrace the Arian than the Nicene faith. And hence their doctrine was opposed in this synod by an addition made to the Nicene creed, and by expressed forms of condemnation. With these ecclesiastical weapons against the Macedonians, worldly ones were combined. In the statutes of the

§ 21. The frenzy of the ancient Gnostics, which had been so often driven out of sight, revived again in Spain. In the beginning of this century, one *Mark*, a native of Memphis, introduced it from Egypt, and communicated it first to a few individuals. After making considerable progress, and even infecting some persons renowned for piety and learning, it was imbibed by *Priscillian*, a man of birth, fortune, and eloquence, afterwards bishop of Avila. Being accused by some bishops before the emperor *Gratian*, *Priscillian* and his followers were banished from Spain: but he returned soon after. Accused again, in the year 384, before *Maximus* (who had seized upon Gaul on the assassination of *Gratian*), he was condemned, with several of his associates, and executed at Treves, in the year 385. The instigators of this punishment were, however, regarded with abhorrence by the bishops of Gaul and Italy: for it was not yet regarded among Christians as a pious and righteous act to deliver heretics over to the civil power to be punished.¹ *Priscillian* being

elder Theodosius (lib. xi. xii. xiii. *Codicis Theodos. de Hæreticis*), they are mentioned by name; and in those of the younger Theodosius, which are inserted in the *Codex Theodosianus* (lib. lix. lx. lxx.), it will be seen that they still existed, but could hold worship only in the principal cities. These civil regulations gave the ill-disposed bishops too much liberty to manifest their persecuting spirit towards the Macedonians, and enabled them wholly to exterminate them, it would seem, under these emperors. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 70—118; and respecting the council of Constantinople, his *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 224, &c. The decrees of this council are given in Beveridge's *Pandecta Canonum*, i. 85. *Schl.*—The first decree respects the creed and anathemas; the second confines bishops to their provinces; the third gives the bishop of Constantinople the rank of *second patriarch*. The four remaining decrees are of less importance. *Tr.*—‘From the date of this council, Arianism was formed into a sect exterior to the Catholic church; and taking refuge among the barbarian invaders of the empire, is merged among those external enemies of Christianity, whose history cannot be regarded as strictly ecclesiastical.’ Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*, 421. S.]

¹ See Sulpitius Severus, *Hist. Sacra*, ii. 46, 51, and Dialog. iii. *de Vita Martini*, c. 15. [Priscillian had ability to present his doctrine with so much dexterity and eloquence that he gained many friends both among the high and the low; and his sentiments were soon spread through all Spain. Among his adherents there were some bishops, particularly Instantius and Sylvianus, and many ladies of respectability. Hyginus, bishop of Corduba, who afterwards went over to the Priscillianists, was the first to

oppose his doctrine: and for this purpose made a representation of it to Idacius, the bishop of Merida, who, by his rash violence against bishop Instantius, blew the fire of the Priscillianist war into a great flame. After many and long contests, a council was held at Saragossa in 380, at which the Priscillianist doctrine was condemned, and the bishops Instantius and Salvianus, with the laymen Elpidius and Priscillian, were excommunicated. This measure rendered the sect more resolute and determined; and Priscillian, that he might be more safe, was raised by the party from a layman to be bishop of Avila. The civil power was put in motion against the sect; and Idacius obtained from the emperor Gratian a decree, by which this sect, as well as others, was banished the country. This decree depressed them for a time. The leaders of the party took their course towards Rome; and while passing through France, they seduced many, especially in Aquitain. Although they got no hearing at Rome, yet they found means to obtain a rescript from Gratian, by which the former decree was repealed, and these bishops were restored again to their offices. When Maximus had seized the government, he issued, at the instigation of Ithacius, another Spanish bishop, a command to the Priscillianist teachers, to appear before the ecclesiastical council of Bourdeaux. Here Instantius, who readily and frankly answered the interrogatories of the council, was deposed; but Priscillian appealed to the emperor. Bishop Martin, of Tours, saw with concern a civil judge about to pass sentence in an ecclesiastical affair, and made representation on the subject to the emperor, who assured him that no blood should be shed. Yet the emperor was finally persuaded by some bishops, to commit the investigation of the subject to

slain, his opinions were not at once suppressed, but spread far and wide in Spain and Gaul; and even in the sixth century, the *Priscillianists* caused much trouble to the bishops of those provinces.

§ 22. The doctrines of the Priscillianists no one of the ancients has accurately described; on the contrary, some of them have perplexed and obscured the subject. It appears, however, from authentic records, that the Priscillianists came very near in their views to the Manichæans. For they denied the *reality* of Christ's birth and incarnation; maintained that the visible universe was not the production of God, but of some demon or evil principle; preached up the existence of *Æons*, or *emanations* from God; declared human bodies to be prisons fabricated by the author of evil for celestial minds; condemned marriages, denied the body's resurrection, and the like. Their rules of life were very severe: for what many state concerning their flagitious and libidinous practices, rests on no credible testimony. That the Priscillianists used dissimulation, and eluded their enemies by deceiving them, is true; but that they regarded all kinds of lying and perjury as lawful, which is commonly reported, has not even the appearance of truth.¹

his minister of state, Evodius, a stern judge. He, at Treves, in the year 385, put Priscillian to the rack, and extorted from him a confession that he had uttered impure principles, had held nocturnal meetings with base females, and prayed naked; and after the facts had been reported to the emperor, Priscillian and some of his adherents were put to death, and others were punished with banishment. This is the first instance of a criminal prosecution for heresy. The Priscillianists regarded these executions as a martyrdom, while their opposers sought in this bloody way to exterminate them; and the emperor had it in contemplation to send military officers into Spain, with full power to search out the heretics, and deprive them of life and property. But here again bishop Martin showed himself in an amiable light. He repaired to Treves, and there made such representations as prevented the execution of the emperor's designs. Yet the people shed the blood of heretics in many places; and some bishops had such unchristian minds as to approve of it. Yet others, on the contrary, disapproved of it; and had great dissension with the former, in regard to it. The Priscillianists, however, still continued to be numerous in Spain, especially in Galicia; and in the fifth century, when the irruption of the barbarians into Spain threw the ecclesiastical affairs into great disorder, it afforded this sect opportunity again to spread itself very much. And in the sixth century, Aguirre has inserted in the *Concil. Hispan.* ii. 269, &c. a letter of Montanus, bishop of Toledo, in 527, from which it appears that many persons of

this sect then lived in Valencia; and in 561, a council was held against them at Braga. From this time onwards, no more is heard of them; and they must either have gradually wasted away, or have fallen at once on the irruption of the Saracens. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 387—430. *Schl.*]

¹ See Simon de Vries, *Diss. Critica de Priscillianistis*, Trajecti, 1745, 4to, in which the principal fault is, that he follows too closely Beausobre's *History of the Manichees*, taking everything there asserted to be true. Fran. Girvesii *Historia Priscillianistarum Chronologica*, Romæ, 1750, 8vo. In Angeli Calogeræ *Opusculi Scientifici*, xxvii. 61, occurs: *Bacharius illustratus, seu de Priscilliana heresi Diss.* which, however, is occupied less in illustrating the Priscillianists than Bacharius [a learned Spaniard, who composed a short treatise *de Fide*, first published by Muratori (*Anecdota Latino-rum*, t. ii.), and which some consider as a polemic tract against the Priscillianists. To these must be added Walch, *l. c.* p. 378—481. — To ascertain the real doctrines of the Priscillianists is perhaps impossible. The quotation from an epistle of Priscillian, which Orosius has preserved (in his *Com-monorium; inter Opp. Augustini*, viii. 431), is so obscure, that it would be natural to suppose his contemporaries did not correctly understand him. Hence we cannot rely entirely on the testimony of the ancients, even if they appear to have been impartial. Still it appears unquestionable, that Priscillian embraced Gnostic and Manichean errors; that he misconstrued the Scriptures, and perverted them by allegorical interpre-

§ 23. To these larger sects certain minor ones may be added. One *Audæus*, an honest man, who had been ejected from the church in Syria, for too freely reproving the corrupt lives of the clergy, collected a congregation, and made himself its bishop. Being banished by the emperor into Scythia, he went among the Goths, and there propagated his sect with good success. As to the time when this sect arose, the ancients are not agreed. In some of their institutions they deviated from other Christians; among which peculiarities, this is especially noticed by the ancients, that, contrary to the decree of the Nicene council, they celebrated the feast of Easter on the same day with the Jewish Passover. They are said, moreover, to have attributed to the Deity a human form, and to have held some other opinions little consonant with truth.¹


tations; that he relied on apocryphal books as of divine authority; that he believed in the eternity of matter, and held that the evil angels were not creatures of God; that he also believed the world was not the work of God, and that all changes in the material universe originated from the evil spirits. The soul, he taught, is a particle of the divine nature, separated from the substance of God; the human body, as all other flesh, came from the devil. And even the production of man, by the union of a soul with a body, was the work of evil spirits. They believed in an unconditional necessity for the changes a man undergoes, and which they ascribed to the influence of the stars. They denied the personal distinction of the three persons in the Godhead. It is very probable, that they controverted the *human* nature of Christ; and it is still more probable that they denied him a *real body*, than that they denied him a *human soul*. From these principles, it would follow, that they did not believe in a resurrection of the body. The same principles led them to disapprove of marriage, and of the procreation of children; and to forbid the eating of flesh. Their moral principles were, in general, strict, and tended to produce an ascetic life. And on this account, the accusation of shameless debauchery, brought against them by their adversaries, is very improbable. Whether they all held prevarication, lying, and perjury, to be allowable, even in cases where one's religion is to be avowed, is uncertain. Yet it is very certain, that some of them held this dangerous principle; as, for instance, Dictinnius, from whose book Augustine quotes the arguments used to justify lying, which he confutes, in his book *de Mendacio, ad Consent*. Yet that Priscillian and his first set of followers did not think so, appears from their suffering martyrdom. *Schl.*]

¹ Epiphanius, *Heres.* lxx. p. 811. Augustine, *de Heres.* cap. l. Theodoret, *Fabul.*

Hæret. lib. iv. c. 9. Joach. Schröder, *Diss. de Audæanis*; which is in Joh. Voigt, *Bibliotheca Historiæ Hæresiol.* tom. i. pt. iii. p. 578. [Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 300—321. —The founder of this sect is called both Audius and Audæus; and his followers, both Audiani and Audæani; and not unfrequently Anthropomorphites, because they were taxed with attributing to God a human form. Audius was of Mesopotamia; and stood in high estimation among the Syrians, on account of his holy life, and his great zeal for the honour of God. The last was so great, that he publicly punished his own brother, and would not flatter the avaricious and luxurious bishops; and for this he endured persecution, hatred, and reproach. But he was undismayed, and bore it all with patience. Yet when at last the hatred of his enemies went so far as often to beat him and his friends, he separated himself from the church (though, previously, some had refused him communion), formed a party, and got himself ordained its bishop. This step made the separation complete; for it was contrary to all ecclesiastical rules, which required at least *three* bishops to solemnise an ordination, and forbade the ordination of any schismatical bishop. The orthodox bishops entered a complaint against him before the emperor, who banished him at an advanced age into Scythia. This occasioned his going among the Goths, and converting many of that nation to Christianity. He erected monasteries among them, recommended the monastic life, ordained bishops, and died before the general persecution by Athanasius. Audæus held a few errors. He believed that God possessed not a perfect human *body*, but a human *shape*, and of course the form of human *limbs*; and that the fashion of the human body was copied from the divine shape, to which the scriptural term, *image of God*, is to be referred. In regard to their worship, his followers were strict *separatists*, and would

§ 24. To this century, also, the Greeks and orientals refer the origin of the sect called *Messalians* and *Euchites*: and indeed, clear traces of them first appear in the latter part of this century; though their principles were much more ancient, and were known before the Christian era, in Syria, Egypt, and other countries of the East. These persons, who lived secluded from intercourse with the world, in the manner of monks, derived their name from their habits of *prayer*. For they believed, that an evil demon naturally dwells in the mind of every man, which can be expelled no otherwise than by continual prayers and hymns, but being once expelled, the soul will return to God pure, and be again united to the divine essence, from which it has been torn away. To this leading principle they added, as is clear enough, other strange notions, closely allied to the sentiments of the Manichæans, and derived from the same source from which the Manichæans derived their doctrines, namely, the oriental philosophy.¹ In short, the Euchites were a sort of *mystics*, who

not worship at all with those Christians who were of an irreligious life, or who held communion with the irreligious. Nay, they discarded the name of *Christians* for that of *Audians*, because many of them had abused the name of *Christians*, in order to secure their safety. They were *Quartodecimans*; that is, they kept Easter at the time the Jews did; and defended the practice, by appealing to the Apostolical Constitutions. They held apocryphal books, and had their own system of church discipline. In general, it may be said, they were rather *fanatics* than proper heretics. Their errors were proof rather of a weak head than of a perverse heart; and their defence of their errors and contempt for other Christians, were the effects of their [religious or] fanatical pride. *Schl.*]

¹ Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxx. p. 1067. Theodoret, *Hæret. Fabul.* iv. 10. Timotheus Presbyter, *de Receptione Hæreticor.* in Joh. Bapt. Cotelier's *Monumenta Eccles. Græcæ*, iii. 403, &c. Ja. Tollius, *Insignia Itineris Italici*, p. 110, &c. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, i. 128, t. iii. pt. ii. 172, &c. and others: [Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 481—536. The names *Messalians* and *Euchites* signify *prayers* or *praying brethren*. The first is Syriac [a participle, from the root , *oravit*], and the latter is Greek [*Εὐχίται* or *Εὐχῆται*, from *εὐχή*, *oratio*. See Suicer, *Thesaur. Eccles.* i. 1285, &c. and Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 2. *Tr.*] They were so called, because they believed the essence of religion to consist in prayer, that is, in that tranquil state of mind in which a person neither thinks nor has volitions. They were also called *Enthusiasts*, because they pretended to be inspired, and to hold converse with the Holy Spirit; *Choreuta*

(*χορευταί*, *dancers*), from this motion of their bodies, which they commonly used; the *Spiritual* (*πνευματικοί*), which was the name they gave to themselves; also *Lampetians*, *Adelphians*, and *Marcianists*, from certain of their leaders. There were both pagan and Christian *Messalians*. The former acknowledged indeed a plurality of gods, yet they worshipped but *one*, whom they called *ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, the *Almighty*. These were more ancient than the Christians, built houses for worship similar to the Christian churches, and assembled morning and evening, with torches and candles, and employed their time in praising God; whence they were called *Euphemites*. The Christian *Messalians* were so named from the coincidence of their practice with that of the pagans; they seem to be the offspring of monkish enthusiasm, and to have first appeared in Mesopotamia, and thence to have spread into Syria; but their origin cannot be traced with more particularity. They seem not to have been a party who had determinate, fixed principles of faith, peculiar to themselves. Their number also appears never to have been great. They were all ascetics, though not all monks, in the proper sense of the word. Their religious theory was founded on an impure mysticism, common to nearly all fanatical persons and communities, and which originated, like the system of Manes, from the principles of the oriental philosophy. Yet the *Messalians*, like all enthusiasts, appear to have relied more upon spirits, apparitions, and revelations, than upon the oriental metaphysics. Their principles did not necessarily lead to vice, yet might afford occasion for it. And, in fact, there were among them many whom idleness and spiritual pride led into gross offences. And there were not wanting

imagined, according to the oriental notion, that two souls resided in man, the one *good* and the other *evil*; and who laboured to expedite the return of the former to God by contemplation and prayer. This sect drew over many to its ranks by its outward show of piety: and the Greeks waged war with it through all the subsequent centuries. Yet it should be remembered, that the names *Messalians* and *Euchites* were used with great latitude among the Greeks and orientals, and were applied to all who endeavoured to raise the soul to God, by calling it away from every sensual influence, though these persons often differed very materially in their religious opinions.

§ 25. Towards the close of this century, Arabia and the adjacent countries were disturbed by two opposite sects, the *Antidico-Marianites* and the *Collyridians*. The former contended, that the virgin *Mary* did not remain always a virgin; but that she had intercourse with her husband, *Joseph*, after the birth of our Saviour. The latter, whom females especially favoured, went to the opposite extreme; they worshipped *St. Mary* as a goddess, and thought that she ought to be honoured and appeased with libations, sacrifices, and offerings of cakes.¹ The more obscure and unimportant sects I pass without notice.

among them real villains, who abused the mystical stupidity of others, to subserve their own wicked purposes. Heretics, in the strict sense, they were not; although, led astray by their pernicious mysticism, they embraced wrong fundamental principles in regard to practical and experimental religion; and actuated by these, they, at least in part, fell into heretical opinions. *Schl.*]

¹ See Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxviii. lxxix. p. 1033 and 1057. [*Κολλυρίδες*, in Latin *collyridæ*. *Tr.*—Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 577, &c. Walch mentions (p. 598) one Bonosus, concerning whom he also published a dissertation at Göttingen, 1754, *de Bonoso hæretico*. He was, probably, bishop of Sardica in Illyricum, near the end of this century. He was accused of maintaining that *Mary* did not always remain a virgin, but bore several children. And this charge seems to have been true. But whether Bonosus denied also the divinity of Christ, and taught that he was the Son of God only by adoption, is very dubious. So much is certain, that in the fifth and sixth centuries there were opposers of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the divinity of Christ, who in France and Spain were known by the name of Bonosians. Still, it is uncertain whether they derived the name from this, or from

some other Bonosus. The reader may consult Ittig's *Supplementum Operum Clementis Alexandrini*; where, in the annexed *Fascic. Observat. Miscellan. ad Hist. Eccles.* p. 242, there is an Essay, *de Hæresi Bonosi*. The Collyridians (for Epiphanius makes them all females) carried their respect for the mother of Jesus so high, that they were justly charged by the orthodox fathers with superstition. They came from Thrace and Scythia, into Arabia. It was their practice to dress out a car, or a square throne (*κερικόν*), spread over it a linen cloth, and on a clear day, once a year, place on it a loaf of bread, or cake (*κολλυρίς*), which they offered to the Virgin *Mary*. Mosheim (in his *Lectures*) considered them as a set of simple persons, who had considerable heathenism about them; and supposed that while they were pagans, they were accustomed to bake and present to Venus, or Astarte (the moon), cakes called *collyrides*; and when they became Christians, thought this honour might now be best shown to *Mary*. The doctor had in his eye, perhaps, the passage in Jeremiah (viii. 18); and it is well known, that the offering of cakes in the pagan worship was a customary thing. See Walch, p. 625, &c.; and Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xii. 83. *Schl.*]

FIFTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. State of the Roman empire — § 2. Further decline of idolatry — § 3. Nations converted to Christianity — § 4. Conversion of the German nations — § 5. The Franks — § 6. The Irish — § 7. Causes of these conversions.

§ 1. To understand the causes of such things as were encountered by the Christians in this century, a portion of its civil history must be kept in view. We shall, therefore, first observe concisely that the Roman empire, at the commencement of this century, was divided into two parts, one of which embraced the eastern, and the other the western provinces. *Arcadius*, the emperor of the East, resided at Constantinople. *Honorius*, whom the West obeyed, lived at Ravenna in Italy. The latter, commendable for nothing but mildness of disposition, neglected the affairs of the empire. Hence the Goths first laid waste Italy several times, and plundered Rome most miserably. This first great calamity of the Roman state in its western territories, was followed by many others of a heavier kind, under the succeeding emperors. For the ferocious and warlike people of Germany overran those fairest provinces of Europe, Italy, Gaul, and Spain, and set up new kingdoms in them. At last the Heruli, in the year 476, under *Odoacer*, their chief, having vanquished *Romulus Augustus*, who is commonly called *Augustulus*, overturned the empire of the West, and brought Italy under their subjection. Sixteen years after, *Theodoric*, king of the Ostrogoths, inhabiting Illyricum, attacked these unwelcome intruders by the authority of the Greek emperor, and vanquished them; in consequence of which, the kingdom of the Ostrogoths was established in Italy, in the year 493, and continued

with various fortune till the year 552.¹ These new kings of the West kept up, indeed, an appearance of respect for the majesty of the emperors reigning at Constantinople, and chose to live seemingly under their fealty and protection; but, in reality, they were quite independent, especially *Theodoric* in Italy, a man of distinguished abilities, and left nothing to the emperors but a certain shadow of supremacy.²

§ 2. Amidst these wars and the dreadful calamities that arose from them, the cause of Christianity suffered much. Yet the Christian emperors, especially those of the East, continued their efforts to extirpate what remained of the ancient idolatry. In particular, *Theodosius* the younger³ has left striking proofs of his zeal in this matter; for we have still extant various laws of his, requiring the idolatrous temples to be utterly destroyed, or to be dedicated to *Christ* and the saints, abrogating the pagan ceremonies and rites, and excluding the adherents to paganism from all public offices.⁴ In the western parts alone efforts of this kind were somewhat less; and we therefore find the Saturnalia, the Lupercalia, the gladiatorial shows, and other idolatrous customs, observed with impunity, both at Rome and in the provinces, and men of the highest rank and authority publicly professing the religion of their ancestors.⁵ But by degrees this liberty was more circumscribed, and spectacles too inconsistent with the sanctity of the Christian religion were everywhere suppressed.⁶

§ 3. The limits of the Christian church were extended, both in the East and in the West, among nations yet addicted to idolatry. In the East, the inhabitants of the two mountains, Libanus and Antilibanus, being miserably harassed by wild beasts, sought aid against them from the famous *Symeon Stylites*, of whom we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. *Symeon* told them that their only remedy was to forsake their ancient superstitions and embrace

¹ For a fuller account, see the Abbé de Bos, *Hist. Crit. de la Monarchie Française*, i. 258, &c.; and Jos. Ja. Maseov's *History of the Germans*, written in German. [Also Edw. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. 29—31, 33—36. Tr.]

² Car. du Fresne, *Diss.* xxiii. *ad Histor. Ludovici S.* p. 280. Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* ii. 578, 832; and *Annal. Italiæ*: Giannone, *Histoire de Naples*, i. 207. Joh. Cochlæi, *Vita Theodorici Ostrogothorum regis*, with the observations of Joh. Peringskiöld, Stockholm, 1699, 4to.

³ [A. D. 408—450. Tr.]

⁴ *Codex Theodos.* vi. 327, 331, &c.

⁵ See Macrobius, *Saturnalia*; in particular, lib. ii. p. 190, ed. Gronovii; Scipio Maffei, *delli Anfiteatri*, lib. i. p. 56, 57. Pierre le Brun, *Histoire Critique des Pratiques Superstitieuses*, i. 237, and others; but especially Bernh. de Montfaucon, *Diss. de Moribus tempore Theodosii M. et Arcadii ex Chry-*

sostom.: which is found in Latin, in the *Opp. Chrysostomi*, tom. xi. and in French, in the *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. et des Belles Lettres*, tom. xx. p. 197, &c. [The pagans traced the calamities of the empire to the prevalence of Christianity. Therefore, in 408, at the instigation of the Tuscan soothsayers, idolatrous sacrifices were again established at Rome, in order to procure success against Alarie; and pope Innocent, who was apprised of the measure, allowed it to take place, if we may believe Zosimus, v. 41, on condition that the sacrifices should be offered without noise. To confute this accusation of the populace against Christianity, was the design of Augustine's twenty-two books *de Civitate Dei*, addressed to Marcellus. *Schl.*]

⁶ Near the close of the century, Anastasius in the East prohibited the combats with wild beasts, and the other shows. See Jos. Simon Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* i. 268, 272.

Christianity. These mountaineers obeyed the counsel of the holy man; and having become Christians, they saw the wild beasts flee away, if writers tell the truth. The same *Symeon*, by his influence (for I doubt the existence of any miracle), caused some portion of the Arabians to adopt the Christian worship.¹ In the island of Crete a considerable number of Jews, finding that they had been shamefully imposed upon by one *Moses*, a Cretan, who pretended to be the Messiah, voluntarily embraced Christianity.²

§ 4. The German nations, who rent in pieces the western Roman empire, were either Christians before that event, as the Goths and others, or they embraced Christianity after establishing their kingdoms, in order to reign more securely among the Christians. But at what time, and by whose instrumentality, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Alans, and some others, became Christians, is still uncertain, and is likely to remain so. As to the Burgundians, who dwelt along the Rhine, and thence passed into Gaul, it appears from *Socrates*,³ that they voluntarily became Christians near the commencement of the century. Their motive to this step was the hope that *Christ*, or the God of the Romans, who they were informed was immensely powerful, would protect them from the incursions and the ravages of the Huns. They afterwards joined the Arian party, to which also the Vandals, Suevi, and Goths were addicted. All these warlike nations measured the excellence of a religion, by the military successes of its adherents, and esteemed *that* as the best religion, the professors of which were most victorious over their enemies. While,

¹ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, i. 246, &c.

² Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 38. [In the time of Theodosius II. an impostor arose, called Moses Cretensis. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. They assembled, with their wives and children, and followed him to a promontory. He there commanded them to cast themselves into the sea. Many of them obeyed and perished in the waters, and many were taken up and saved by fishermen. Upon this, the deluded Jews would have torn the impostor to pieces; but he escaped them, and was seen no more. Likewise in the island of Minorca many persons abandoned Judaism. Yet their conversion does no great honour to the Christians; for it was in consequence of great violence done to the Jews, of levelling their synagogue with the ground, and taking away their sacred books. See the account of their conversion by the bishop of the Balearic islands: Severus, *Epist. Encycl. de Judæorum in hac insula Conversione et de Miraculis ibidem factis*; published from a MS. in the Vatican library, by Baronius, in his *Annales Eccles.* A. D. 418, and abridged

by Fleury, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, l. xxiv. Yet it is certain that the Jews even in that age often imposed on the Christians by pretending to have favourable views of Christianity. This appears from the *Codex Theodos.* lib. xvi. tit. 8, leg. 23; and Socrates (*H. E.* viii. 17) mentions a Jew, who received baptism, with a considerable sum of money, successively from the orthodox, from the Arians, and from the Macedonians, and finally applying to the Novatians for baptism, was detected by the miracle of the disappearance of the water from the font. Although this miracle may be doubted, and the impostor may have been detected by an artifice of the Novatian bishop, yet it appears from the story, that what is practised by many Jews at the present day, is no new thing. *Schl.*]

³ *H. E.* vii. 30. [They applied to a bishop in Gaul, who directed them to fast seven days, and baptized them on the eighth. Semler (*Hist. Eccles. Selecta Capita*, i. 203) supposes this event took place about 415. And in this year, according to the *Chronicon* of Prosper, the Burgundians took possession of a part of Gaul on the Rhine with the consent of the Romans and their confederates, having promised to embrace Christianity. *Schl.*]

therefore, they saw the Romans possessing a greater empire than other nations, they viewed *Christ* their God as more worthy of homage than any other.

§ 5. It was this motive which produced the conversion of *Clovis*,¹ or *Lewis*, king of the *Salii* (a tribe of the Franks), who conquered a large part of Gaul, and there founded the kingdom of the Franks, which he endeavoured to extend over all the Gallic provinces; a bold, cruel, barbarous, selfish, and haughty prince. For in the year 496, in a battle with the Alemanni at Tolbiacum,² when his situation was almost desperate, he implored the aid of *Christ*, whom his wife *Clotildis*, a Christian, and daughter of the king of the Burgundians, had long recommended to him in vain; and he made a vow that he would worship *Christ* as his God, provided he obtained the victory. Having become victorious, he stood to his promise, and in the close of that year was baptized at Rheims.³ Some thousands of Franks followed the example of their king. It has been supposed that, besides the exhortations of his wife, the expectation of an extension of his dominions contributed to induce him to renounce idolatry for Christianity; and it is certain that his profession of Christianity greatly assisted him in establishing and enlarging his kingdom. The miracles reported on this occasion are unworthy of credit; in particular, that greatest of them, the descent of a dove from heaven with a phial full of oil, at the baptism of *Clovis*, is either a fiction, or, as I think more probable, a *deception* craftily contrived for the occasion.⁴ For such pious frauds were much resorted to in that age, both in Gaul and Spain, in order to captivate more readily the minds of the barbarous nations. It is said that the conversion of *Clovis* gave rise to the custom of addressing the French monarchs with the

¹ [*Chlodoveus*, *Hludovicus*, *Ludovicus*. *Tr.*—The Teutonic origin of these Latin forms is Hludwig, Loud Warrior, *Bohr arjabós*. *Ed.*]

² [Zulpich, twelve miles from Cologne. *Mac.*]

³ See Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francor.* ii. 30, 31. Henry, Count von Bünau, *Historia Imperii Romano-Germanici*, i. 588, &c. Abbé de Bos, *Hist. Crit. de la Monarchie Française*, ii. 340, &c. [and J. G. Walch, *Diss. de Clodoveo M. ex rationibus politicis Christiano*, Jena, 1751. *Schl.*—*Clovis*, once hearing a pathetic discourse on the sufferings of Christ, exclaimed: 'Si ego ibidem cum Francis meis fuisset, injurias ejus vindicasset;'⁴ *Had I been there with my Franks, I would have avenged his wrongs.* See Fredegarius, *Epitom.* c. 21. Aimoin, i. 16; and *Chronicon S. Dionysii*, i. 20. *Tr.*]

⁴ Against this miracle of the phial, Joh. Jac. Chifflet composed his book, *de Ampulla Rhemensi*, Antw. 1651, fol. The reality of the miracle is defended, among many others, by the Abbé Vertot, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscript. et des Belles Lettres*, iv. 350, &c. After considering all the cir-

cumstances, I dare not call the fact in question. But I suppose that St. Remigius, in order to confirm the wavering mind of the barbarous and savage king, artfully contrived to have a dove let down from the roof of the church, bearing a phial of oil, at the time of the king's baptism. Similar miracles occur in the monuments of this age. [The possibility of the event is made conceivable in this way. Yet there still remain weighty historical objections to the reality of the fact. The story rests solely on the authority of Hincmar, a writer who lived 300 years after the time. Aytus, Anastasius, and even Gregory of Tours, and Fredegarius, are wholly silent on the subject. Besides, Hincmar's narrative contains the improbable circumstance, that the clergy who should have brought the oil that was wanting, could not get near the font, on account of the pressure of the crowd; but as anointing with oil was then practised at every person's baptism, it is improbable, that on so solemn an occasion as this, due preparation for this part of the service would have been neglected. *Schl.*]

titles of *Most Christian Majesty*, and *Eldest Son of the Church*;¹ for the kings of the other barbarous nations which occupied the Roman provinces were still addicted to idolatry, or involved in the errors of Arianism.

§ 6. *Cælestine*, bishop of Rome, sent into Ireland to spread Christianity among the barbarians of that island, in the first place, *Palladius*, whose labours were not crowned with much success. After his death, *Cælestine* sent *Succathus*, a Scotchman, whose name he changed to *Patricius* [*Patrick*], into Ireland, in the year 432; a man of vigour, and, as appears from the event, not unfit for such an undertaking. He was far more successful in his attacks upon idolatry; and having converted many of the Irish to Christianity, he, in the year 472, established at *Armagh* the see of an archbishop of Ireland.² Hence *St. Patrick*, although there were some Christians in

¹ See Gabr. Daniel's and the Abbé de Camp's *Diss. de Titulo Regis Christianissimi*; in the *Journal des Sçavans*, for the year 1720, p. 243, 404—448, 536, *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, xx. 466, &c.

² See the *Acta Sanctorum*, Martii, ii. 517, Februar. iii. 131, 179, &c. J. Ware, *Hibernia Sacra*, p. 1, &c. Dublin, 1717, fol. The same Ware published the *Opuscula Sti Patricii*, with notes, London, 1656, 8vo. The synods held by St. Patrick are given by David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Brit. et Hiberniæ*, i. 2, &c. [Harduin's *Collection*, i. 1790, &c.] Concerning the famous cave, called the *Purgatory of St. Patrick*, see Peter le Brun, *Histoire Critique des Pratiques Superstitieuses*, iv. 34, &c. [A full account of St. Patrick and his labours in Ireland, is given by archbishop Ussher, *Ecclesiæ Britannicar. Primordia*, c. xvii. p. 815, &c. *Tr.* — Rapin de Thoyras, in his *History of England* (t. i. b. ii.), remarks, that there were three Patricks or Patrick's. 1. The *elder*, who died in 449, mentioned in the Chronicle of Glastonbury. 2. The *great*, who died in 493, after governing the Irish church for sixty years; he is the one mentioned by Mosheim. 3. The *younger*, who was a nephew of Patrick the Great, and survived his uncle some years. From his writings it appears, that St. Patrick was one of the most skilful men of the age in converting the heathen: yet that he used unsuitable means to convert them—namely, fear, threatenings, and fictitious wonders or prodigies. The Irish will show the cave, which is called *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, in which he shut up gross transgressors to be punished. Enclosed in the cavern [which is 16½ feet long, 2 feet wide, and not high enough for a man to stand in erect, and situated on an island 126 yards long, by 44 broad, in Lake Derg, county of Donegal. *Tr.*], the culprits were exposed to distressing terrors, and reported that they saw infernal

spirits, and various terrific objects. The Englishmen who have visited the cave in modern times, could find nothing there to excite their fears. It appears, therefore, that the terror was produced by artifices. The cavern had certain holes, by which fire might be thrown into it. And the wild Irishmen, believing that the torments they were to endure there were inflicted by the devil, were put into so great fear that they dared not commit any gross offences. *Schl.* — There is no probability that Patrick had anything to do with the cave that eventually became so famous. This, in fact, some say, did not attain celebrity until the 12th century. Lough Derg is upon the borders of Tyrone county, and contains some spots called *holy islands*, which are little else than bleak and barren rocks, and of which the one frequented by pilgrims is called *Station island*. It comprises about half an acre, and has been, even of late years, crowded almost to suffocation, no fewer than 2,000 persons having been there at one time. The majority of the pilgrims appear to be women. Sensible Romanists are, however, growing ashamed of the scenes on this spot, and its vicinity. Hence these pilgrimages are on the decline. Patrick's connexion with Rome is at best perfectly uncertain; or, perhaps, rather it is utterly improbable. Prosper, the chronicler, the friend, counsellor, and panegyrist of Pope Celestine, recommended him to send, in the year 431, a Roman bishop, named Palladius, to Ireland, which already contained some Christian societies. The experiment proved a total failure, Palladius being obliged to retire, after a stay of not many weeks—it has been said of not more than three. His mission, however, is commemorated in the chronicle of Prosper: not so that of Patrick, an omission so strange, on the papal hypothesis, that Romish controversialists have been driven to contend that Prosper gives

Ireland before his day, has been justly called the *Apostle of Ireland*, and the father of the Irish Church, and is held in high veneration to this day.

§ 7. The causes which induced all these pagan nations to abandon the religion of their ancestors and profess Christianity, may be gathered from that which has been already said. He must lack discernment, who can deny that the labours, the perils, and the zeal of great and excellent men dispelled the clouds of darkness from the minds of many; and on the other hand, he must be short-sighted, and not well versed in the history of this age, who cannot see that the fear of the vengeance of man, the hope of temporal advantages and honours, and the desire of obtaining aid from Christians against their enemies, were prevalent motives with many to abandon their gods. How much influence *miracles* may have had it is difficult to say. For though I can easily believe, that God was sometimes present with those pious and good men who endeavoured to instil the principles of true religion into the minds of barbarous nations,¹ it is notwithstanding certain that the greatest part of the prodigies of this age labour under suspicions. In proportion to the simplicity and credulity that generally prevailed, was the boldness of crafty men in contriving impostures:² nor could the more discerning expose their cunning artifices with safety to their own lives and worldly comfort.³ It is commonly the case, that when great danger attends the avowal of the truth, then the prudent keep silence, the multitude believes without inquiry, and the architects of imposture triumph.

intelligible intimations of it, although he says nothing direct upon the subject. Such as have a bias against Romanism, and are, therefore, indisposed for mere inferences and assumptions in its favour, prefer that version of Patrick's history which he gives himself in his *Confession*—an interesting document admitted as genuine by the best critics, and first published by Sir James Ware, from an ancient MS. From this we learn that Patrick was born in Britain, educated in Gaul, and led into Ireland by an irresistible impulse to evangelize the country, having been first consecrated at home. During the remainder of his life, he was haunted by constant yearnings for visits both to his relatives in Britain, and to his early friends in Gaul; but a sense of duty detained him on the scene of his labours in Ireland. He appears never to have been in Italy at all, or to have been any way connected with the Roman bishop. Hence, probably, the silence of Prosper. That chronicler could commemorate the brief experiment of Palladius,

abortive as it proved, because it had a papal origin: but Patrick seems never to have been thought of; probably because his mission, though successful, shed no lustre on the Roman see.—*The Case of the Church of Ireland, stated in a Letter to the Marquess Wellesley*, p. 70. Dublin, 1824. Hall's *Ireland*, iii. 272. S.]

¹ There is a remarkable passage concerning the miracles of this century, in the *Theophrastus, seu de Immortalitate Animæ*, of the acute Æneas Gæzeus, p. 78, ed. Barthii. Some of these miracles, he tells us, he himself had witnessed.—p. 80, 81.

² The Benedictine monks speak out freely on this subject, in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 33. It is a fine saying of Livy, *Histor.* xxiv. 10, § 6: 'Prodigia multa nuntiata sunt, quæ quo magis credebant simplices ac religiosi homines, eo plura nuntiabantur.'

³ Sulpitius Severus, *Dial.* i. p. 438, ep. i. p. 457. *Dial.* iii. cap. ii. p. 487.

CHAPTER II.

THE CALAMITIES OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The evils suffered by the Christians in the Roman empire — § 2. Attempts of the pagans against them — § 3. Their persecutions — § 4. In Persia — § 5. Individual enemies of Christianity.

§ 1. It has been already observed, that the Goths, the Heruli, the Franks, the Huns, the Vandals, and other fierce and warlike nations, who were for the most part pagans, had invaded and miserably rent asunder the Roman empire. During these commotions the Christians at first suffered extremely. These nations were, it is true, more anxious after plunder and dominion than for the propagation of the false religions of their ancestors, and therefore did not form any set purpose to exterminate Christianity; yet the worshippers of idols, who still existed everywhere scattered over the empire, neglected no means to inflame the barbarians with hatred against the Christians, hoping by their means to regain their former liberty. Their expectations were disappointed, for the greatest part of the barbarians soon became Christians themselves; yet the followers of *Christ* had everywhere first to undergo great calamities.

§ 2. The friends of the old religions, in order to excite in the people the more hatred against the Christians, while the public calamities were daily increasing, renewed the obsolete complaint of their ancestors: That all things went on well before *Christ* came; that since he had been everywhere embraced, the neglected and repudiated gods had let in evils of every kind upon the world. This puny shaft was shivered by *Augustine*, in his *Books on the City of God*, a copious work, crowded with various erudition: at his suggestion, also, *Orosius* wrote his *Books of History*, to show that the same, nay, even greater, calamities and plagues had afflicted men, before the Christian religion was published to the world. In Gaul the calamities of the times drove many to such madness that they wholly excluded God from the government of the world, and denied his providence over human affairs. These were vigorously assailed by *Salvian*, in his *Books on the government of God*.

§ 3. But the persecutions of the Christians deserve to be more particularly noticed. In *Gaul* and the neighbouring provinces, the Goths and Vandals, who at first trampled under foot all the rights both of God and man, are reported to have laid violent hands on innumerable Christians. In *Britain*, when the Roman power was overthrown, the British race was most miserably harassed by its ferocious neighbours, the Picts and Scots. Wherefore, after various

calamities, in the year 445, Vortigern was chosen for its king; and he, finding himself unequal to drive his enemy away, in the year 449, called the Anglo-Saxons from Germany to his aid. But these, having landed troops in Britain, produced far greater evils to the inhabitants than they endured before; for the Saxons became intent upon subduing the old inhabitants, and reducing the whole country under their own power. Hence arose a most sanguinary warfare between the Britons and the Saxons, which continued with various fortune during 130 years, till the Britons were compelled to yield to the Anglo-Saxons, and take refuge in Batavia and Cambria.¹ During these conflicts, the condition of the British church was deplorable; for the Anglo-Saxons, who worshipped exclusively the gods of their ancestors, overthrew it almost entirely, and butchered with extreme cruelty a great multitude of Christians.²

§ 4. In *Persia* the Christians suffered grievously, in consequence of the rash zeal of *Abdas*, bishop of Susa, who demolished the *Pyræum*, or temple dedicated to fire. For, being commanded by the king, *Isdegerdes*, to rebuild it, he refused to comply; for which he was put to death, in the year 414, and the churches of the Christians were levelled to the ground. This conflict, however, seems to have been of short duration. Afterwards, *Vararanes*, the son of *Isdegerdes*, in the year 421, attacked the Christians with greater cruelty, being urged to it partly by the instigation of the Magi, and partly by his hatred of the Romans, with whom he was engaged in war. For as often as the Persians and Romans waged war with each other, the Christians resident in Persia were exposed to the rage of their monarchs, because they were suspected, and perhaps not without reason, to be favourably disposed towards the Romans, and to betray their country to them.³ A vast number of Christians perished under various exquisite tortures during this persecution.⁴ But their tranquillity was restored when peace returned between *Vararanes* and the Romans, in the year 427.⁵ The Jews, also, who were opulent and in good credit in various parts of the East, harassed

¹ [The modern Holland and Wales. *Tr.* — And in the furthest parts of the west of England, Cornwall, and contiguous districts of Devonshire. A dialect of the ancient Cambrian, or Welch language, lingered in Cornwall, among a few old people, till the eighteenth century. *S.*]

² See Bede and Gildas, among the ancients; and among the moderns, Ja. Ussher, *Britannicar. Ecclesiar. Antiquitates*, cap. xii. p. 416, &c., and Rapin de Thoyras, *History of England*, vol. i. b. ii. [The Saxons were not directly persecutors of the Christians, but only involved them in the common calamities of their slaughtered and oppressed countrymen. *Tr.*]

³ Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 39. [Where is a full account of the conduct of *Abdas*, and of the sufferings of the Christians. *Tr.*] Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique*, i. 10,

article *Abdas*. Barbeyrac, *de la Morale des Pères*, p. 320. [An account of the manner in which Christianity obtained free toleration and an extensive spread in Persia at the commencement of this century, through the influence of Maruthas, a bishop of Mesopotamia, who was twice an ambassador to the court of Persia, is given by Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 8. *Tr.*]

⁴ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, i. 182, 248. [See also Theodoret as above. The most distinguished sufferers in this persecution were *Abdas*, the bishop of Susa; *Hormisdas*, a Persian nobleman, and son of a provincial governor; *Benjamin*, a deacon; *James*, who apostatised, but repented; and *Severus*, who possessed a thousand slaves. *Tr.*]

⁵ Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 20.

and oppressed the Christians every way that they could.¹ No one of them gave more trouble, or showed more arrogance, than *Gamaliel*, their patriarch, a man of extraordinary influence; whom, therefore, *Theodosius* Junior restrained by a special edict, in the year 415.²

§ 5. So far as can be learned at this day, no one ventured to write books against Christianity and its adherents during the fifth century; unless, perhaps, the Histories of *Olympiodorus*³ and of *Zosimus*⁴ are to be considered of this character. Of these writers, the latter is everywhere mercilessly and unjustly sharp upon the Christians. Yet no one can entertain a doubt, that the philosophers and rhetoricians, who still kept up their schools in Greece, Syria, and Egypt, secretly endeavoured to corrupt the minds of the youth, and imbue them with at least some portion of the proscribed superstition.⁵ The history of those times has many traces of this clandestine machination, and so have the books of various Christians.

¹ Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 13, and 16; and *Codex Theodos.* vi. 265, &c.

² *Codex Theodos.* vi. 262, &c.

³ Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* lxxx. p. 178. [Olympiodorus was a native of Thebes, in Egypt, a poet, historian, and an ambassador to the king of the Huns. He flourished about 425; and wrote *Historiarum Libri* xxii. addressed to Theodosius II., containing the Roman history, particularly of the west, from 407 to 425. The work is lost, except the copious extracts preserved by Photius,

ubi supra. Tr.]

⁴ Zosimus was a public officer in the reign of Theodosius II. and wrote *Historiarum Libri* vi. in a neat Greek style. The first book gives a concise history of Roman affairs from Augustus to Diocletian; the following books are a full Roman history, down to 410. The best editions are by Cellarius, Jena, 1728, 8vo, and by Reitemier, Lips. 1784, 8vo. Tr.]

⁵ Zacharias Mitylen. *de Opificio Dei*, p. 165, 200, ed. Barthii.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of learning among Christians—§ 2. In the West—§ 3. State of philosophy in the West—§ 4. In the East—§ 5. The younger Platonists—§ 6. Aristotelian philosophy revived.

§ 1. ALTHOUGH the illiterate had access to every office both civil and ecclesiastical, yet most persons of any consideration were persuaded that the liberal arts and sciences were of great use to mankind. Hence there were flourishing public schools¹ in the larger cities, as Constantinople, Rome, Marseilles, Edessa, Nisibis,² Carthage, Lyons, and Treves; and masters competent to teach youth were maintained at the expense of the emperors. Some of the bishops and monks, also, of this century, here and there, imparted to young men what learning they possessed.³ Yet the infelicity of the times, the incursions of barbarous nations, and the penury of great geniuses, prevented either the church or the state from reaping such advantages from these efforts as were expected by those who favoured them.

§ 2. In the western provinces, especially in Gaul, there was no want of learned men, who might have served as patterns for others to follow. Such, among others, were *Macrobius*, *Salvian*, *Vincentius* of Lerins, *Ennodius*, *Sidonius Apollinaris*, *Claudianus Mamertus*, and *Dracontius*; writers, not indeed equal to the ancient Latin authors, but still not altogether provincial, and who gave themselves up to the knowledge of antiquity, with other studies. The barbarians, however, who either ravaged or occupied the Roman territories, choked these relics of a better age. All these nations, in fact, considered glory and virtue of every kind as placed in arms and military

¹ [The history and progress of schools among Christians are the subject of a work by Geo. Gottl. Reufel, Helmst. 1743, 8vo. *Schl.*]

² [The schools at Edessa and Nisibis are noticed by Valesius on *Theodori Lectoris*

Hist. Eccles. ii. 164, b. *Schl.*]

³ [On the episcopal and cloister schools in Africa, Spain, Italy, and Gaul, remarks are made by Ludov. Thomasinus, *de Disciplina Ecclesiæ*, t. i. pt. ii. l. ii. p. 27, &c. *Schl.*]

courage. Hence they despised learning and all the arts. Wherever they settled, accordingly, there barbarism insensibly sprang up and flourished, and the pursuit of learning was abandoned exclusively to the priests and monks. And these, surrounded by bad examples, and living in the midst of wars and perils, gradually lost all relish for solid learning and praise, and substituted in place of it a sickly spectre, and an empty shadow of erudition. In their schools, the boys and youth were taught *the seven liberal arts*;¹ which being comprised in a few precepts, and those very dry and jejune, as appears from the treatises of *Augustine* upon them, were rather calculated to burden the memory than to strengthen the judgment and improve the intellectual powers. As the century, therefore, closed, learning was almost extinct; only a faint shadow of it remained.

§ 3. Those who thought it expedient to study philosophy — and there were but few who thought so — did not in this age commit themselves to the guidance of *Aristotle*. He was regarded as too austere a master, and one who followed truth along a thorny path.² Perhaps more would have relished him had they been able to read and understand him. But the system of *Plato* had for several ages been better known; and was thought not only less encumbered with difficulties, but also to harmonise better with religion. Besides, the principal works of *Plato* were then extant in the Latin translations of *Victorinus*.³ Therefore, such among the Latins as had a taste for philosophical inquiries, contented themselves with the decisions of *Plato*; as will appear to any one who shall only read *Sidonius Apollinaris*.⁴

§ 4. The state of learning among the Greeks and the people of the East, both as respects elegant literature and the severer sciences, was a little better; so that among them may be found a larger number of writers, who exhibit some marks of genius and erudition. Those who prosecuted the science of jurisprudence, resorted much to *Berytus* in Phœnicia, where was a celebrated law school,⁵ and to Alexandria.⁶ The students in physic and chemistry resorted also to Alexandria. The teachers of eloquence, poetry, philosophy, and other branches of education, opened schools almost everywhere; and yet the teachers

¹ [These comprised, I. the *Trivium*, namely, Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic; and II. the *Quadrivium*, or Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, and Astronomy. See below, cent. xi. pt. ii. ch. 1, § 5. *Tr.*]

² Passages from ancient writers in proof are collected by Joh. Launoï, *de varia Aristotelis Fortuna in Academia Parisiensi*.

³ See Augustine, *Confessionum* lib. i. c. 2, § 1. *Opp.* i. 105, 106.

⁴ See his *Epistles*, lib. iv. ep. iii. xi. and lib. ix. ep. ix. and others.

⁵ See Ja. Hasæus, *Liber de Academia Jureconsultorum Berytensi*; and Zacharias Mitylen. *de Opificio Dei*, p. 164.

⁶ Zacharias Mitylen. *de Opificio Dei*, p. 179. [Among the moderns may be consulted J. Andr. Schmidt's Preface to Andr. Hyperius *de Scholæ Alexandrina Catechetica*, Helmst. 1704, 8vo. Hen. Dodwell, *ad fragmentum Philippi Sidetæ*, at the end of his *Dissert. on Irenæus*; Lud. Thomasinus, *de Discipl. Eccles.* t. i. p. i. l. ii. c. 10, p. 210, &c. Joh. Geo. Michaelis, *Exercit. de Scholæ Alexandrinæ sic dictæ Catechetica origine, progressu, et præcipuis doctoribus*; in tom. *Symbolar. Litter. Bremens.* p. 195, &c. and Jos. Bingham, *Antiqq. Eccles.* lib. iii. c. 10. *Schl.*]

at Alexandria, Constantinople, and Edessa, were supposed to excel the others in learning, and in the art of instructing.¹

§ 5. The sect of the younger Platonists sustained itself, and its philosophy, at Athens, at Alexandria, and in Syria, with no small share of its ancient dignity and reputation. *Olympiodorus*, *Hero*,² and other men of high reputation, adorned the school of Alexandria. At Athens, *Plutarch*,³ and his successor, *Syrianus*,⁴ with *Theophrastus*, procured for themselves fame and distinction. From them *Proclus*, unquestionably the leading Platonic of this age, received instruction — a man who gained for himself, and for the philosophy which he professed, so much celebrity among the Greeks, that he seems almost the second father of the system.⁵ His disciples, *Marinus* of Neapolis, *Ammonius*, the son of Hermias, *Isidorus*, *Damascius*, and others, followed eagerly in the footsteps of their instructor, and left many followers who copied their example. Yet the laws of the emperors, and the continual advances of Christianity, gradually diminished very much the fame and the influence of these philosophers.⁶ As there was a sufficient number now among the Christians who cultivated and were able to teach this species of wisdom, so much confided in at that day, it naturally followed, that fewer persons than formerly frequented the schools of these heathen sages.

§ 6. But although the philosophy of *Plato* appeared to most persons more favourable to religion and better founded than that of *Aristotle*, yet the latter gradually emerged from its obscurity, and found its way into the hands of Christians. The Platonists themselves expounded some of the books of *Aristotle* in their schools, and particularly his *Dialectics*, which they recommended to such of their pupils as were fond of disputation. Their example was followed by those Christians who instructed youth in the precepts of philosophy. This was the first step made by the Stagirite towards that universal empire which he afterwards obtained. Another and a firmer was made in the Origenian, Arian, Eutychian, Nestorian, and Pelagian contests, which produced so much evil in the church during this century. That *Origen* was a Platonist, everybody knew. When he fell, therefore, under public censure, many, that they might not be accounted his adherents, applied themselves to the study of *Aristotle*, between whom and *Origen* there had been little or no connexion.

¹ *Æneas Gazæus*, in his *Theophrastus*, p. 6, 7, 16, &c. passim. *Zacharias Mitylen.* loc. cit. p. 164, 179, 217, &c. and others.

² *Marinus*, de *Vita Procli*, c. 9, p. 19, ed. Fabricii. [*Hero* was a preceptor of *Proclus*, and is the second of the three of his name, mentioned by *Brucker* in his *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 323. *Schl.*]

³ [This *Plutarch*, in distinction from the elder *Plutarch*, who was more of an historian than a philosopher, is denominatd *Plutarchus Nestorii*, or *Plutarch* the son of *Nestorius*. See *Brucker*, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 312, &c. *Marinus*, de *Vita Procli*, c. 12,

p. 27, and *Suidas*, article *Plutarch. Nestorii*, p. 133. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Concerning *Syrianus*, see *Brucker*, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 315. *Schl.*]

⁵ His life was written by *Marinus*, and was published with learned notes by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Hamb. 1700, 4to. [See also *Brucker*, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 318, &c. *Schl.*]

⁶ See *Æneas Gazæus*, in his *Theophrastus*, p. 6, 7, 8, 13, ed. Barthii. [*Brucker* (*Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 337) has treated of all these disciples of *Proclus*. *Schl.*]

In the Nestorian, Arian, and Eutychian controversies, both sides fought with the most subtle divisions, distinctions, and quibbles. These were supplied by the philosophy of *Aristotle*, and not at all by that of *Plato*, who never trained men to disputation. The Pelagian doctrine has great affinity with the opinions of *Plato* concerning God and the human soul. Many, therefore, ceased to be Platonists as soon as they perceived this fact, and suffered their names to be enrolled among the Peripatetics.

CHAPTER II.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND ITS TEACHERS.

§ 1, 2. The outward form of church government somewhat changed—§ 3. The prerogatives of patriarchs—§ 4. Evils arising from their authority—§ 5. Contests between them—§ 6. The power of the Roman pontiff—§ 7. Vices of the clergy—§ 8. Causes thereof. The saints—§ 9. Monks—§ 10. Teachers in the Greek church—§ 11. In the Latin church.

§ 1. FROM the operation of several causes, the outward form of government in the church experienced some change. The power of the bishops, particularly of the greater ones, was sometimes augmented and sometimes diminished, according as times and circumstances altered; but the will of courts, and political considerations, had more influence in this matter than any principles of ecclesiastical law. These changes, however, were of minor importance. Of much more consequence was the great increase of honour and power acquired by the bishops of new Rome, or Constantinople, in opposition to the most strenuous efforts of the bishop of old Rome. In the preceding century, the council of Constantinople [381] had conferred on the bishop of New Rome the second rank among the primary prelates of Christendom, on account of the dignity and prerogatives of the city over which he presided. The Constantinopolitan bishops (with the consent, no doubt, of the court) had likewise extended their jurisdiction over the provinces of Asia,¹ Thrace, and Pontus. In this century, with the consent of the emperors, they not only acquired the additional province of eastern Illyricum, but likewise a signal amplification of honour and privilege. For in the year 451, the council of Chalcedon, by its twenty-eighth *canon*, decreed that the prelate of new Rome ought to enjoy the same rights and distinctions as the pontiff of old Rome, on account of the equal dignity and rank of the two cities,²

¹ [*Proconsular Asia. Tr.*]

² [Yet it appears, from the words of the canon, that the bishop of Constantinople, though made equal in *power and authority* with the bishop of Rome, was to yield

to him a precedence in *rank or honour*; because New Rome took rank after her older sister. δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχειν. *Tr.*]

and by a formal act, it confirmed his jurisdiction over the provinces in which he had gained a footing. *Leo* the Great, pontiff of old Rome, did, indeed, vehemently resist this decree, and so did other bishops; but in vain; for the Greek emperors sided with their own prelates.¹ After this council, accordingly, the Constantinopolitan prelate began to strive sharply with the Roman, and to oppress the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. In this contest, *Acacius* of Constantinople is said to have exceeded all bounds.²

§ 2. It was nearly at the same time that *Juvenal*, bishop of Jerusalem, or rather of *Ælia*, attempted to withdraw himself and his church from the jurisdiction of the bishop of *Cæsarea*, and laid claims to a place among the first prelates of the Christian world. His object was rendered more feasible by the dignity and estimation that Christians allowed to the church of Jerusalem, because it was not only reckoned one of the apostolical churches, but it seemed likewise to have succeeded into the place of the primitive church of Jerusalem, and to be the mother of all churches. Therefore *Juvenal*, the emperor *Theodosius* Junior favouring his designs, besides assuming the rank of independent bishop of the three Palestines, or that of *patriarch*, also wrested Phœnicia and Arabia from the patriarchate of Antioch. And as this produced a controversy between him and *Maximus*, bishop of Antioch, the council of Chalcedon settled the dispute, by restoring Arabia and Phœnicia to the see of Antioch, and leaving *Juvenal* in possession of the three Palestines,³ with the title and rank which he had assumed.⁴ In this manner there were those five principal bishops over the Christian world, created in this century, who were distinguished from the others by the title of *patriarchs*.⁵ The oriental writers ordinarily add a sixth; namely, the bishop of *Seleucia and Otesiphon*, to whom, they say, the bishop of Antioch voluntarily ceded a part of his jurisdiction.⁶ But they can bring no proof, except the Arabic decrees of the Nicene council, which are well known to have no authority.

§ 3. These *patriarchs* had great prerogatives. To them belonged the consecration of the bishops of their respective provinces. They annually convoked councils of their districts, to regulate and settle ecclesiastical affairs. If any great or difficult controversy arose, it was carried before the patriarch. The bishops accused of any offences were obliged to abide by his decision. And finally, to provide for the peace and good order of the remoter provinces of their patriarchates,

¹ Mich. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 30, &c. [Walch, *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* 310; and *Historie der Päpste*, 106. *Schl.* — and Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, ii. 64—84. *Tr.*]

² *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit.* t. i. artic. *Acacius*, p. 75, &c. [Mosheim here speaks incautiously; for *Acacius*, all circumstances considered, was to be justified. See below, ch. v. § 21. *Schl.*]

³ Concerning the three Palestines, see i. 9, 13, &c.

Carolus a S. Paulo, *Geographia Sacra*, p. 307, &c.

⁴ Mich. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 110, &c.

⁵ See the writers who have treated of the patriarchs, as enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* cap. xiii. p. 453, &c. [See also Note on cent. iv. p. ii. c. 2, § 3. *Tr.*]

⁶ Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*,

they were allowed to place over them their legates or *vicars*.¹ Other prerogatives of less moment are omitted. All the provinces, however, did not acknowledge the authority of the patriarchs; but some, both in the East and West, were exempt from their jurisdiction, and independent of exterior control.² Moreover, the emperors, who reserved to themselves a supreme power over the church, listened readily to the complaints of those who thought themselves injured; the councils also, in which the majesty and legislative power of the church resided, presented various obstacles to the arbitrary exercise of patriarchal power.

§ 4. The constitution of ecclesiastical government was so far from contributing to the peace and prosperity of the Christian church, that it was rather the source of very great evils, and produced boundless dissensions and animosities. In the first place, the *patriarchs*, who had power either to do much good or to cause much evil, encroached without reserve upon the rights and privileges of their bishops, and thus introduced gradually a kind of spiritual bondage; and that they might do this with more freedom, they made no resistance to the encroachments of the bishops on the ancient rights of the people. For the more the prerogatives and the honours of the bishops who were under their control were increased, the more was their own power enlarged. In the next place, they designedly excited dissensions and fomented controversies of bishops with one another, and with other ministers of religion, and also of the people with the clergy, so that they might have frequent occasions to exercise their authority, be much appealed to, and have a multitude of clients around them. Moreover,

¹ David Blondel, *de la Primauté de l'Eglise*, cap. xxv. p. 332, &c. Theod. Ruinart, *de Pallio Archi-episcopali*, p. 445, tom. ii. of the *Opp. posthuma* of Joh. Mabillon.

² Edw. Brerewood, *de Veteris Ecclesiæ Gubernatione Patriarchali*, a tract which is subjoined to Ja. Ussher's *Opuscula de Episcoporum. et Metropolitanorum Origine*, Lond. 1687, and Bremen, 1701, 8vo, p. 56—85. [The metropolitans and bishops who were subject to no patriarch were, by the Greeks, called *αὐτοκέφαλοι*. Of this description were the metropolitans of Bulgaria, Cyprus, Iberia, Armenia, and also of Britain, before the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons by the Roman monk Augustine. For the Britons had their archbishop of Caerleon [upon Usk, in Monmouthshire, S.] (*Episcopus Caerlegionis, super Osca*), who had seven bishops under him, but acknowledged no superintendence from the patriarch of Rome, and for a long time made opposition to him; and in Wales, as well as in Scotland and Ireland, this independence continued many centuries. The church of Carthage was also, properly, subject to no other church; as appears from Leydecker's *Historia Eccles. Africanæ*, and from the writings of Capell and others, *de Appellationibus ex Africa ad Sedem Ro-*

manam.—Some common bishops, likewise, were subject to no metropolitan, but were under the immediate inspection of their patriarch. Thus the patriarch of Constantinople had thirty-nine bishops in his diocese, who were subject immediately to him [the patriarch of Alexandria had immediate control over all his bishops, without any metropolitans. *Ed.*], and the Roman patriarch had in all his countries (e. g. in Germany, at Bamberg and Fulda) bishops who were subject to no archbishop or primate, but dependent immediately on himself.—There were also certain bishops who were subject neither to any archbishop nor to a patriarch; as was the case with the bishop of Tomi, in Scythia, according to Sozomen, *H. E.* vi. 21 [who had archiepiscopal rank, but had no suffragans. *Ed.*]. The churches in countries lying without the Roman empire, at first had no bishops dependent on the bishops within the empire; as e. g. the churches in Persia, Parthia, and among the Goths; and these did not come under the power of Roman patriarchs until they fell under the civil power of the Romans. Most of the conversions of pagans, by missionaries from Rome, were in the western provinces of the empire. See Baumgarten's *Erläuterung der christl. Altherth.* p. 158, &c. *Schl.*]

that the bishops might not be without intestine foes, nor themselves destitute of strenuous defenders of their authority, they drew over to their side the numerous tribes of monks, who were gradually acquiring wealth, and attached them to their interests by the most ample largesses. And these monks contributed much — perhaps more than any other cause — to subvert the ancient discipline of the church, to diminish the authority of the bishops, and to increase beyond all bounds the power of their patrons.

§ 5. To these evils must be added the rivalry and ambition of the *patriarchs* themselves, which gave birth to abominable crimes and the most destructive wars. The patriarch of Constantinople, in particular, elated with the favour and the proximity of the imperial court, on the one hand, subjected the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch to a subordination to himself, as if they were prelates of a secondary rank; and on the other hand boldly attacked the Roman pontiff, and despoiled him of some of his provinces. The two former, from want of strength and other causes, made indeed but feeble resistance, though they sometimes produced violent tumults and commotions; but the Roman pontiff, possessing much greater power and resources, fought with more obstinacy, and in his turn inflicted deadly wounds on him of Byzantium. Those who shall carefully examine the history of events among Christians from this period onward, will find that from these quarrels about precedence and the boundaries of their power, among men who pretended to be the fathers and guardians of the church, chiefly originated those direful dissensions which first split her eastern branch into various sects, and then severed it altogether from the western.

§ 6. No one of these ambitious prelates was more successful than the Roman. Whatever opposition might be made by his brother of Constantinople, various causes enabled him to augment his power in no small degree, although he had not yet laid claim to the dignity of supreme lawgiver and judge of the whole Christian church. In the East, the Alexandrian and Antiochian patriarchs, finding themselves unequal to contend with the Constantinopolitan, often applied to the Roman for aid against him;¹ and the same was done by the lesser bishops whenever they found the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch invading their rights. To all these the pontiff so extended his protection, as thereby to advance the supremacy of the Roman see. In the West, the indolence and diminished power of the emperors left the bishop of the metropolis at full liberty to attempt whatever he pleased. And the conquests of the barbarians were so far from opposing obstacles to his growing domination, that they rather advanced it. For these kings, caring for nothing but the establishment of their thrones, when they saw the people guided by the bishops, and these dependent almost wholly upon the Roman pontiff, deemed it good

¹ [This is illustrated, among other examples, by the case of John Talaia, patriarch of Alexandria, who, being deposed (A.D. 482), applied to the Roman bishop

Simplicius for protection. See Liberatus Diaconus, *Breviar.* c. 18. *Schll.* — and Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, ii. p. 189, &c. 194. *Tr.* — Neale's *Patr. Alex.* ii. 19. *Ed.*]

policy to secure his favour by bestowing on him privileges and honours. Among all those who governed the see of Rome in this century, no one strove more vigorously and successfully to advance its authority than *Leo*, who is commonly surnamed the *Great*. But neither he, nor the others, could overcome all obstacles to their ambition. This is evident, among other examples, from that of the Africans, whom no promises nor threats could induce to consent to have their causes and controversies carried by appeal before the Roman tribunal.¹

§ 7. Of the vices of the whole clerical order, their luxury, their arrogance, their avarice, their voluptuous lives, we have as many witnesses as we have writers of integrity and gravity in this age, whose works have come down to us. The *bishops*, especially such as were distinguished for their rank and honours, employed various administrators to manage their affairs, and formed around themselves a kind of sacred court. The dignity of a *presbyter* was supposed to be so great, that *Martin* of Tours did not hesitate to say, at a public entertainment, that the emperor himself was inferior to one of that order.² The *deacons* were taxed with their pride and their vices, in many decrees of the councils.³ These stains on the character of the clergy would have been deemed insufferable, had not most of the people been sunk in superstition and ignorance, and had not all estimated the rights and powers of Christian teachers by those of the ancient priests, as well Hebrew as Greek and Roman. Even the fierce and warlike tribes of Germans, who vanquished the Romans and divided the empire of the West among themselves, after they had embraced Christianity, could bear with the dominion and the vices of the bishops and the priests, because they had before been subject to the domination of priests; and they supposed the Christian priests and ministers of religion to possess the same rights that had been formerly conceded to the priests of their gods.⁴

¹ Lud. Ell. du Pin, *de Antiqua Eccles. Disciplina*, Diss. ii. p. 166, &c. Melch. Leydecker, *Hist. Eccles. Africanæ*, tom. ii. Diss. ii. p. 505, &c. [A concise view of the steps by which the bishops of Rome mounted to the summit of their grandeur, is thus given by J. Andr. Cramer, in his German translation of Bossuet's *Universal History*, iv. 558, &c. as cited by Von Einem, in a note on this page of Mosheim. They were appointed by the emperors to decide causes in the western churches; they encouraged appeals to themselves; they assumed the care of all the churches, as if it were a part of their official duty; they appointed vicars in churches, over which they had no claims to jurisdiction; where they should have been only mediators, they assumed to be judges; they required accounts to be sent them of the affairs of foreign churches; they endeavoured to impose the rites and usages of their own church upon all others, as being of apostolic origin; they traced their own elevation

from the pre-eminence of St. Peter; they maintained that their fancied prerogatives belonged to them by a *divine right*; they threatened with excommunication from the church those who would not submit to their decrees; they set up and deposed metropolitans in provinces over which they never legally had jurisdiction; and each successive pope was careful, at least, not to lose anything of the illegal usurpations of his predecessors, if he did not actually add to them. The truth of this representation is abundantly confirmed with the evidence of historical facts, among others, by Bower, in his *Lives of the Popes*, 7 vols. 4to, London, 1749, &c. *Tr.*]

² Sulpitius Severus, *de Vita Martini*, cap. xx. p. 339, and Dial. ii. cap. vi. p. 457.

³ See Dav. Blondel, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris*, p. 140.

⁴ [Another obvious reason of the greater importance attained by the Roman patriarch, was, the absence of the court. The

§ 8. This corruption of those whose duty it was to inculcate holiness both by precept and example, will afford us less surprise when we consider, that a great multitude of persons was everywhere admitted indiscriminately, and without examination, into the sacred order; many of whom had no other object than to live in idleness. And among these great numbers were neither connected with particular places and congregations, nor had any regular employment, but roamed about at large, procuring a subsistence by imposing upon the credulity of others, and sometimes by dishonourable artifices. Whence, then, some will ask, those numerous *saints*, whom this age produced, as writers tell both of the East and of the West? From the ignorance of the age, whoever were of more than ordinary ability, and could write or speak better than men in general, whoever were endued with a certain dexterity in managing affairs of the graver kind, or with an uncommon degree of mastery over the mind and its emotions; these persons were viewed by those around them, not as men, but as gods; or, to speak more correctly, as men divinely inspired and full of the Deity.

§ 9. The *monks*, who had formerly lived for themselves, and had not sought any rank among the clergy, gradually became a class distinct from the common laity, and acquired such privileges and opulence, that they could maintain an honourable rank among the pillars of the church.¹ The reputation of this class of persons for piety and sanctity was so great, that very often, when a bishop or presbyter was to be elected, he was chosen from among them;² and the erection of edifices in which monks and nuns might conveniently serve God, was carried beyond all bounds.³ They did not, however, all observe the same way of life; but some followed the rules of *Augustine*, others those of *Basil*, others those of *Antony*, *Athanasius*, *Pachomius*, or some one else.⁴ Yet it must have been the fact, that

emperor was an inhabitant of the new capital, the old afforded no resident capable of overshadowing its wealthy and influential bishop. The West also was far less civilised than the East, hence far more likely to supply its own centre of knowledge and refinement with applications for advice and interference. S.]

¹ Epiphanius, *Exposit. Fidei*, Opp. i. 1094. Joh. Mabillon, *Réponse aux Chanoines réguliers*, Opp. Posthum. ii. 115.

² Sulpitius Severus, *de Vita Martini*, c. x. p. 320. Add *Dial.* i. c. xxi. p. 426.

³ Sulpitius Severus, *Dial.* i. p. 419. Henry Noris, *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. ii. c. 3, in *Opp.* i. 273. *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, ii. 35.

⁴ [A *monk* was one who professed to renounce this world, with all its cares and pleasures, and to make religion his sole business. The particular manner in which he proposed to employ himself was called his *rule*. The early monks, of the third

century, were all Eremites or hermits. Such in particular were the Egyptian monks. In the fourth century they became so numerous in Egypt, as to turn their favourite desert into a populous country; and St. Anthony, a leading man among them, induced great numbers to adopt his particular rule. St. Pachomius about the same time organised the monks of Tabennesis into a kind of *society*; and henceforth most monks became *associated hermits*, having separate cells, but living under chiefs called *abbots*. Basil the Great improved on the plan of Pachomius, by erecting houses in different parts of the country, in which monks might live together in a kind of family state. He also made his monasteries *schools* of sacred learning. St. Athanasius, according to some, while resident in Italy, taught the people of that country how to form and regulate these associations. And St. Augustine first established a kind of monastery in his native

they were all very negligent and remiss in the observance of their rules, the licentiousness of monks even in this age having become proverbial;¹ and these armies of lazy men, we are told, excited in various places dreadful seditions. From the enactments of councils of this century it clearly appears, that all monks of every sort were under the protection of the bishops in whose dioceses they lived; nor did the *patriarchs*, as yet, arrogate to themselves any jurisdiction over them.²

§. 10. Among the Greek and oriental writers of this century, the most distinguished, perhaps, was *Cyril*, bishop of Alexandria, very famous for his different controversies and writings. No impartial person will divest him of all praise; yet no good man will excuse his quarrelsome temper, his restless spirit, and his very great transgressions.³ Next

town in Africa; and afterwards, when bishop, he, and some of his clergy, formed an association for religious purposes, which gave rise to the *regular Canons*, a species of clergy whose private life was that of monks. During the fifth century, the passion for monastic life was very great, and monks and nuns became extremely numerous in the West as well as the East. Yet hitherto there had not been required of monks any vows of *perpetual* celibacy, poverty, and obedience, nor of adherence for ever to any one rule of life; but every one was free to continue a monk or not, and to pass from one society or class of monks to another at his option. Different monasteries had different rules, according to the wills of their founders or governors; but in all, the written rules, if they had any, were few and simple, the abbots possessing despotic power over their little kingdoms. The diversity which now prevailed among the monasteries as to their rules, is thus described by Mabillon (*Annales Benedictini*, lib. i. § 13, tom. i. p. 6, &c.), 'As well in the East as in the West, there were almost as many different forms and rules, as there were different cells and monasteries,' says Cassianus, *Institut.* l. ii. c. 1. In some, the pleasure of the abbot was the only rule; in others, the mode of life was regulated by custom and former usage; in most, however, there were written rules. And because all monastic rules, whether written or not, aimed at one and the same object, viz. to withdraw men from all worldly concerns, and from all worldly thoughts, so that they might be wholly devoted to God and religion; the monasteries were not, in general, so confined to any one rule, but that they could adopt or superinduce another at the discretion of the abbot; and this, without changing their profession, and without harm. Hence, in the same monastery, diverse written rules were observed at the same time, with

such modifications as were necessary to adapt them to particular times and places. And yet, amidst this great diversity of rules, there was the greatest harmony among all the monks, who constituted in reality but one society and one body, and were distinguished from each other by no peculiarities of dress. Removal also from one monastery to another, and mutual abode with each other, were easy and free; and not only where both monasteries were of Latins, but also where one was of Latins and the other of Greeks.' *Tr.*]

¹ Sulpitius Severus, *Dial.* i. cap. viii. p. 399, &c.

² See Joh. Launoy, *Inquisitio in Chartam Immunitatis B. Germani*, in his *Opp.* tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 3, &c. 38, &c. In the ancient records, posterior to this century, the monks are often called (*clerici*) clergymen. See Joh. Mabillon, *Prefatio ad Secul. II. Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti*, p. xiv. And this is evidence, that they now began to be ranked among the *clergy*, or ministers of the church.

³ The works of Cyril were published by Joh. Aubert, at Paris, 1638, six vols. [in seven parts], folio.—[St. Cyril was nephew to Theophilus, and his successor in the chair of Alexandria, from A.D. 412 to 444. Soon after his election, he persecuted the Novatians; assumed the direction of political affairs; quarrelled with Orestes, the governor of Egypt; and [is accused by his enemies of having] occasioned several insurrections and much bloodshed at Alexandria, instigated the murder of Hypatia, an eminent female philosopher, and pulled down the Jews' synagogue, plundered it, and chased the Jews from the city. See Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 7, 13, 14, 15, and Damascius, in Suidas, *Lex.* voce *Ἰππάρχια*. From 329, he was the most zealous and efficient opposer of Nestorius and his doctrines; wrote against him; condemned his doctrines in a synod at Alexandria, in his noted twelve Chapters; presided

to him must be placed *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrus, an eloquent, copious, and learned writer, whose merits in every branch of theological learning are by no means contemptible, notwithstanding that he appears to have imbibed some part of the Nestorian doctrine.¹ From *Isidore of Pelusium* we have epistles, which display more piety, ingenuity, erudition, and judgment, than the large volumes of some others.² *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria, has left us very little in

in the council of Ephesus, where Nestorius was condemned and deposed, A.D. 431. His zeal against Nestorius drew on himself deposition by some oriental bishops; but he was soon restored. With the bishop of Rome he was always on the most friendly terms. He was certainly a man of talents, and his voluminous writings display much acuteness and learning, though the style is unpolished and not very clear. More than half of them are expositions of the Scripture; viz., of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the minor Prophets, and the Gospel of John. The others are polemic treatises against Arians, Nestorians, and others, who erred in respect to the Trinity and the person of Christ; ten books against Julian; about fifty Sermons; and near sixty Letters. See his life in Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xviii. 313—354. *Tr.*]

¹ For a fine edition of the whole works of Theodoret, we are indebted to the Jesuit, Jac. Sirmond, who edited them at Paris, 1642, in four volumes, folio. The Jesuit, Jo. Garnier, afterwards added a *fifth* volume, Paris, 1685, folio. [Theodoret, or Theodorit, was born at Antioch, about 386, of wealthy and pious parents. He was their only child, and, like Samuel, the son of their vows; and, therefore, named Theodoretus, *given of God*. When not quite seven years old, he was placed in a neighbouring monastery for education, where he had for associates Nestorius and John, who became the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch; and for instructors, Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia, and Chrysostom, from whom he learned eloquence and sacred literature. He became early pious, was made first lector and then deacon, in the church of Antioch; and, in the year 420, was ordained bishop of Cyrus, a considerable city in Syria, near the Euphrates, where he is said to have had the charge of 800 churches. The country was overrun with anti-Trinitarian sectarians and with Marcionites; of whom he nearly purged his diocese, having, as he says, baptized no less than 10,000 Marcionites. In 429, his early friend Nestorius broached his errors respecting the person of Christ, and was condemned by Cyril of Alexandria. Theodoret espoused the cause of his friend, which involved him in a quarrel with Cyril as long as they lived. He was one of those who,

in the year 431, deposed Cyril at Ephesus; for which he was sent home in disgrace by the emperor, Theodosius II. Cyril died in 444; and Theodoret expressed his joy at the event, which so enraged the emperor that he confined him to his house. In 449, he was deposed in the second synod of Ephesus, and applied to the pope, who now espoused his cause. Theodosius died in 450, and his successor restored Theodoret to his see, and afterwards summoned him to be a member of the council of Chalcedon in 451, where he professed his orthodoxy, and was reluctantly brought to condemn Nestorius. After this, returning to his diocese, he devolved most of his episcopal duties on Hypatius, and devoted himself to writing books, till 457, when he died, aged about 71. He was frank, open-hearted, ingenuous, had elevated views and feelings, was resolute and unbending, yet generous, sympathetic, and ardently pious. His learning was great, his genius good, and his productions among the best of that age. The first and second volumes of his works embrace his Commentaries on the greater part of the Old Testament. Volume III. contains Comments on all the Epistles of Paul; *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in five books (a continuation of Eusebius, from A.D. 320 to A.D. 427, written in a style elevated, clear, and well adapted to history) [ed. by Gaisford, Oxon, 1854. *Ed.*]; *Philothheus*, or *Historia Religiosa* (eulogies of thirty distinguished monks); and 146 Epistles. Volume IV. contains four books or dialogues, entitled *Eranistes*, or *Polymorphus* (polemic, on the person of Christ); *Hæreticarum Fabular.* libri v. (an account of the ancient Heresies); *de Providentia Orationes x. adversus Gentes*, or *Græcarum affectionum curatio* (an apology for Christianity), in twelve books [ed. by Gaisford, Oxon, 1839. *Ed.*]; and some other small pieces. The fifth volume contains some other expository pieces, several sermons, thirty-four epistles, and seven dialogues against the Arians, Macedonians, and Apollinarians. All his works, Greek and Latin, with notes, were republished by J. L. Schulze, Halle, 1768—74, in five volumes, in *nine*, 8vo. See his life, in Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xviii. 355—432. *Tr.*]

² The best edition of these letters is that of the Jesuit, Andr. Schott, Paris, 1638, fol.

writing; but has perpetuated his name by his opposition to *Origen* and to his followers.¹ *Palladius*, on account of his *Lausiac History*, and his *Life of Chrysostom*, deserves a place among the better and more useful writers.² Notwithstanding that *Theodore* of Mopsuestia was accused, after his death, of the grossest error, yet every one who has examined the extracts from his writings by *Photius*, will regret that his works are either entirely lost, or exist only in Syriac among the Nestorians.³ *Nilus* composed many works calculated to excite religious

[Isidorus was probably a native of Alexandria, but he spent his life in a monastery near Pelusium, on one of the mouths of the Nile; and hence his surname of Pelusiota. He was active and conspicuous from 388 to 431. As a monk, he was very austere, and devoted himself to reading and expounding the Scriptures, and to the practice and the promotion of piety and virtue. He chose the epistolary form of writing; and has left us 2,013 short letters, arranged in five books. In most of them, a question is proposed, and answered by the exposition of a text of Scripture. The object is to expound the Scriptures, and to inculcate the doctrines and duties of religion. He was an admirer of Chrysostom, and, of course, had difficulty with Theophilus and Cyril, the patriarchs of Alexandria. But he feared no man whenever he thought duty called him to defend truth, or to censure vice. *Tr.*]

¹ See Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 103. [Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria from 385 to 412, was a man of a strong, active, courageous mind; but crafty, unscrupulous, selfish, and ambitious. He probably spent some of his early years among the monks of Nitria. Afterwards he became a presbyter of Alexandria, wrote a Paschal Cycle in 380, and was made bishop in 385. In 388, when Theodosius I. waged war in Italy upon Maximus the usurper, Theophilus sent his legate, Isidorus, to Rome, with letters and presents for both emperors, but with instructions to await the issue of the battle, and then to present only the letter and presents directed to the victor. (Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 2.) In 391, he solicited and obtained of the emperor leave to persecute the pagans of Alexandria, and proceeded to demolish their temples, and seize whatever was valuable in them. Insurrections, and bloodshed, and the flight of the philosophers from Egypt, were the consequence. (Sozomen, *H. E.* v. 16.) The major part of the ignorant monks of Nitria had so gross ideas of the Supreme Being, as to suppose that he literally had eyes and feet and hands; and were, therefore, called Anthropomorphites. But the better informed monks held, that these expressions were to be taken metaphorically, as Origen had always inter-

preted them. And thus this controversy resolved itself into a contest respecting Origen's correctness as a theologian. At first, Theophilus favoured the Origenists; but the Anthropomorphites came upon him tumultuously, about 399, and compelled him to change sides. From this time, he was a zealous persecutor of all Origenists (notwithstanding he continued to read and admire his works), and actually made a bloody crusade against those Nitrian monks who opposed the Anthropomorphites, drove them from Egypt, and followed them with persecution; and also all who befriended them, in particular Chrysostom, whom he deposed in the year 403. See Sozomen, *H. E.* vi. 7—17. Sozomen, viii. 11—19. His works are not numerous, and have never been collected and published by themselves. They consist of three Paschal Letters, translated by S. Jerome; several Letters; and considerable extracts from different polemic treatises. *Tr.*]

² See cent. iv. pt. ii. c. 2, § 9, note.

³ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 227, [and *ibid.* pt. i. p. 3—362, where we have Ebed Jesu's catalogue of his works. Theodorus was born and educated at Antioch, where he was some time a presbyter, and where he and Chrysostom instructed youth in a monastery, and had for pupils Theodoret, the famous Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, and John, patriarch of Antioch. In 392, he was made bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, where he spent thirty-six years, with great reputation as a preacher, a bishop, and especially as an author. After his death, which happened in 428, he was accused of Nestorian, and likewise of Pelagian, sentiments; and was condemned as a heretic, in the fifth general council at Constantinople, A.D. 553. His writings were very numerous, embracing literal expositions of nearly the whole Bible; elaborate polemic works against the Arians, Eunomians, Apollinarists, &c., with many Sermons and Epistles, and a Liturgy. A Latin translation of the last is in Renaudot, *Liturgiar. Oriental. Collectio*, ii. 616—625. [The commentaries on the minor prophets were published by Mai, *Ser. Vet. Nova. Coll.*, vol. vi. ed. 1832, and by à Wegnern, at Berlin,

emotions, but more commendable for the writer's good intentions than for careful execution.¹ Our designed brevity obliges us to pass over what might be worthy of notice in *Basil* of Seleucia,² *Theodotus* of Ancyra,³ *Gelasius* of Cyzicus,⁴ and others.⁵

in 1834; those on the N. Test., by Fritsche, at Zurich, in 1847. *Ed.*] His *Expositio Fidei* entire, with copious extracts from many of his other works, are extant in the Acts of the fifth general council, *apud* Harduin, t. iii., in the works of Marius Mercator, and of other Fathers, and in the *Catena Patrum*, especially the *Catena in Octateuchum*, Lips. 1772, 2 vols. fol.; and in Münter's *Fragmenta Patr. Gr.* Fascic. i. 79, &c. Copenhagen, 1788, 8vo. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xv. 176—218; and Lardner, *Credibility*, &c. ix. 389, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ [Nilus was born of a noble family, at Constantinople, where he became prefect of the city. Under the preaching of Chrysostom he became 'pious, renounced the world, separated from his wife, and taking one of his two sons with him, retired among the monks of Egypt, where he spent the remainder of his days. By robbers he lost all his property, and had his son captured; but he recovered his son. He was made a presbyter, and probably lived till near the middle of this century. His numerous writings have been read with pleasure by the lovers of monastic piety. His 355 Epistles were published, Greek and Latin, by Leo Allatius, Rome, 1668, fol.; and his *Opuscula*, (twenty-one treatises on moral and ascetic subjects), Greek and Latin, by Jos. Maria Suarès, Rome, 1673, fol. *Tr.*]

² [Basil was bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, before 448, and continued so till after 458. He possessed some talents; but he was an unstable man. In a council at Constantinople, A.D. 448, he voted with the orthodox, and condemned Eutyches. The next year, in the council of Ephesus, he openly sided with the Eutychians, and anathematized the orthodox. And two years after, in the council of Chalcedon, he appeared again on the orthodox side, and said he had been compelled to act with the Eutychians; but he had much difficulty to persuade the orthodox of his sincerity, and to allow him his episcopal office.—His works were published, Greek and Latin, subjoined to those of Gregory Thaumaturgus and Macarius, the monk, Paris, 1622, fol. They consist of forty-three Orations; seventeen on the Old Testament, and twenty-six on the New; written in a lofty style, and tolerably perspicuous, but excessively flowery. The *Demonstration* that Christ has come, against the Jews, founded on the seventy weeks of Daniel, and the two books on the *Life of St. Thecla*, the virgin and martyr, though

printed among his works, are supposed by many to be not genuine. *Tr.*]

³ [Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra, in Galatia, flourished about 430. Little is known of him, except that he acted a conspicuous part in the council of Ephesus, which condemned Nestorius, in 431. Three Orations, which he then delivered at Ephesus (two on Christmas-day, and one against Nestorius), are extant, Greek and Latin, among the acts of that council, conc. iii. p. 988, 1008, 1024. Another of his orations was published with the works of Amphilochius, Paris, 1644. His *Exposition of the Nicene Creed*, or *Confutation of Nestorius*, was published, Greek and Latin, by Combefis, Paris, 1675, 12mo. Theodotus, in the close of the last-mentioned work, refers to his three books on the *Holy Spirit*, which are lost; as are his seven books against Nestorius, addressed to Lausus. He has been accounted a good polemic writer. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Gelasius Cyzicenus was a native of Cyzicus, on the Propontis, where his father was a presbyter. He flourished about 476, and was bishop of Cesarea in Palestine. He is known chiefly by his *History of the Nicene Council*, or, as the Greek MSS. style it, his *Ecclesiastical History*, in three books. The *first* book contains the affairs of Constantine, till the death of Licinius in 324. The *second* contains subsequent events, the calling of the council, and the transactions in it, and during it, especially the disputes of the philosophers and Arians with the Nicene fathers. The *third* book, which is now lost, contained the subsequent life and deeds of Constantine. As for the sources from which he drew his information, he tells us, that when a boy at Cyzicus, he met with an old MS. history of the Nicene council, written by one Dalmatius, a former bishop of Cyzicus; that he then made large extracts from it; and many years after, composed his history from these extracts and from the writings of Eusebius, Rufinus, &c. This work of Gelasius, once in high repute, is now little esteemed; in particular, the accounts of the disputes of the philosophers and Arians, which constitute the greater part of the second book, are considered very questionable. The two surviving books were published, Greek and Latin, by R. Balfour, Paris, 1599, 8vo; and in Harduin's *Concilia*, t. i. *Tr.*]

⁵ [The Greek and oriental writers, passed by in silence by Mosheim, are very nume-

§. 11. Among the Latin writers, the first place is due to the Roman

rous. As some knowledge of them is useful, and indeed necessary, for a theologian, a tolerably complete catalogue of them, extracted from Cave's *Historia Litteraria*, is here subjoined.

Asterius, bishop of Amasea in Pontus; flourished about A.D. 401; an eloquent and popular preacher. More than twenty of his Homilies are published by Combefis and Cotelier.

Marcus, a monk of Nitria, Egypt; flourished A.D. 401. Seven tracts on practical piety, written with great simplicity, are extant in Fronto Ducaeus, *Auctar. Biblioth. Patr.* t. i.

Victor of Antioch, a contemporary of Chrysostom; wrote a Commentary on Mark's Gospel; extant, Latin, in the *Biblioth. Patr.* iv. 370.

Severianus, bishop of Gabala in Syria, flourished A. D. 401; a turgid writer, but a popular preacher. *Twelve* of his orations are extant, among the works of Chrysostom.

Heracles, a monk of Constantinople; flourished A.D. 402. He wrote *Paradisus*, or Lives of the Fathers; much of which is copied into the Lausiac History of Palladius, and the remainder published by Cotelier, *Monument. Eccl. Gr.* t. iii.

Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, 406—427; an enemy of Chrysostom, but famed for learning, address, and piety. Two of his letters, and some fragments, are extant.

Polychronius, bishop of Apamea; flourished A.D. 410—427; was brother to Theodorus of Mopsuestia. His exposition of the Canticles, and fragments of his Commentary on Ezekiel and Daniel, are extant.

Nonnus, a converted Pagan poet, of Egypt; flourished A.D. 410. His *Dionysiaca*, in forty-eight books, written before his conversion, have been often published; *e. g.* Hanoviae, 1605, 8vo. His poetic version of John's Gospel was published, Greek and Latin, by Heinsius, 1627, 8vo.; and his *Collectio et Explicatio Historiarum*, by R. Montague, Eton, 1610, 4to. He was a scholar, but a turgid writer.

Synesius [see cent. iv. pt. ii. c. 1, § 2, note.]

Philip of Side in Pamphylia, a friend of Chrysostom, and candidate for the see of Constantinople in 427. He wrote a prolix religious History, from the creation to his own times, in 36 books, of which only extracts remain.

Eudocia, a learned Athenian lady, born A.D. 401, converted to Christianity at 20, and soon after married to the emperor Theodosius II.; proclaimed empress in 432; divorced, for a slight cause, in 445; then retired to Jerusalem, and spent her life in

works of charity and beneficence; and in composing *Centones Homerici*, poetic paraphrases of the Bible, and other religious poems. She died A.D. 459, aged 58.

Philostorgius, born in Cappadocia A.D. 368, well educated at Constantinople, a Eunomian or Ultra-Arian in principle. He composed, about 425, an *Ecclesiastical History*, in twelve books, extending from the first rise of Arianism, to 425. The work itself is lost, but an epitome of it, by Photius, was edited by Valesius, among the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians. His work was partial to the Arians, and is therefore censured by Photius and others.

Sabinus, bishop of Heraclea in Thrace; flourished A.D. 425. He was of the sect of Macedonius; and published a collection of the acts of the councils, from 325 to 425, of which some extracts are preserved by Socrates and others.

John, bishop of Antioch, A.D. 427—441. He at first supported his early friend Nestorius, but afterwards abandoned him and his sect. Six of his Epistles are extant, Gr. and Lat., in *Concilia*, t. iii.; and fifteen more, Latin, in Lupus' Collection of Ephesine Epistles.

Nestorius, presbyter at Antioch, and bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 428—431. As a bishop he was very zealous to suppress all the prevailing heresies; but he soon incurred the charge of heresy himself [for the history of which see below cent. v. pt. ii. c. v. § 5, &c. and notes]. Besides numerous extracts from various of his works, several entire Epistles and some Sermons are extant, in the Collections of councils, in Lupus' Ephesine Epistles, and in the works of Chrysostom, Mercator, &c.

Meletius, bishop of Mopsuestia, A.D. 428 and onwards; a staunch Nestorian, deposed and banished for this heresy. Eleven of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Isaac, a converted Jew, flourished A.D. 430, author of a treatise on the *Trinity*, and the *incarnation of Christ*, in bad Greek; extant among the *Opuscula Veterum dogmatica*; published by Sirmond, Paris, 1630, 8vo.

Acacius, a monk, and bishop of Beroa, from about 378 to 436. He was a man in high repute, and has left us three epistles.

Acacius, bishop of Melitene in Armenia; a staunch opposer of Nestorius in the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. A homily he delivered there, and an epistle, are extant, in the *Concil.* t. iii. and in Lupus' Ephesine Epistles.

Dorotheus, bishop of Marianopolis in Mæsia; a bold defender of Nestorius at Ephesus A.D. 431, and therefore deposed,

pontiff. *Leo I.* surnamed the *Great*: a man of eloquence and genius,

and at last banished. Four of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis in Syria; a defender of Nestorius at Ephesus A.D. 431, and therefore deposed and banished. He had twenty-three Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Maximinus, bishop of Anazarbus in Cilicia; a defender of Nestorius, at Ephesus A.D. 431, but afterwards renounced him. He has three Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Helladius, for sixty years abbot of a monastery near Antioch, and then bishop of Tarsus. While a bishop, he defended Nestorius in the council of Ephesus, and for some time after, but at length renounced him. Six of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Eutheries, archbishop of Tyana; de-fended Nestorius in the council of Ephesus, though not a Nestorian in sentiment. He was deposed and banished. Five of his Epistles are extant in the Ephesine Collection; and seventeen of his Sermons, against various heresies, Gr. and Lat., among the works of Athanasius.

Paul, bishop of Emesa; a defender of Nestorius in the Ephesine council, but who afterwards retracted. He has left us a confession of his faith, two Homilies, and an Epistle.

Andreas, bishop of Samosata; a defender of Nestorius from 429 to 436, when he renounced him. He has eight Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Proclus, amanuensis to Chrysostom and to Atticus; and the bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 434—446. He was a very pious man, a good scholar, and a popular preacher. His works, consisting of twenty Sermons, and six Epistles, were published, Gr. and Lat., by Riccardi, Rome, 1630, 4to.

Ibas, from about 436, bishop of Edessa. He was accused of Nestorianism, and acquitted, in 448; but was accused again, and condemned, in 449, and restored in 451. The greater part of a valuable letter of his, containing a history of the Nestorian contests, is extant, Gr. and Lat., in the *Concilia*, iv. 661.

Socrates, Scholasticus, a barrister at Constantinople; flourished A.D. 440. He composed a faithful *Ecclesiastical History*, from the accession of Constantine the Great, to 439, in seven books; which is edited by Valesius, among the Greek Eccl. Historians.

Hermias Sozomenus, also a Constantinopolitan barrister and an author of an Ecclesiastical History, from 324 to 439, in nine books. He is a more vivacious writer than Socrates, but is deemed less judicious. Yet, writing after Socrates, he has supplied some

of his deficiencies. The work was edited by Valesius, among the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians.

Irenæus, count of the empire, and the emperor's commissioner at the council of Ephesus in 431. He favoured the Nestorians in that council, and defended their cause all his life, and, therefore, was excluded the court in 435; became bishop of Tyre in 444; was deposed by the emperor in 448; and then commenced writing a copious Memoir of the Ephesine council, and of ecclesiastical affairs in the East for about twenty years. The work is lost, except the old Latin translation of certain parts of it, which was published by Christian Lupus, Louvain, 1682, 4to, under the title of *Variorum Patrum Epistolæ ad Concilium Ephesinum pertinentes*.

Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 447—449. He has left us two Epistles and a Creed; extant in Baluze, *Nov. Collect. Concilior*.

Eutyches, the heretic, a presbyter of Constantinople. He so opposed Nestorianism, as to deny the *two natures* of Christ, and confound the Persons of the Trinity. This error he broached in 448. He was condemned the same year; appealed to a general council, and was again condemned in 451. A confession of his faith, with a few of his Letters, is extant.

Eusebius, first a civilian at Constantinople, and then bishop of Dorylæum in Phrygia. He was the public accuser of Nestorius, of Eutyches, and of Dioscorus; from 430 to 451. His Libels and some other of his documents are extant.

Diadochus, bishop of Photice in Epirus; flourished A.D. 450. He has left us some treatises on practical religion; ed. Gr. at Florence, 1578; and Lat. in *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. v.

Euthalius, a deacon in Egypt; flourished perhaps A.D. 458. He wrote an analytical Introduction to the books of the New Testament, published, Gr. and Lat., by Zacagnius, Rome, 1698, 4to.

Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 471—488; very ambitious and active for the aggrandisement of his see. He has left us only two Epistles.

Nestorianus, a Greek chronographer, who flourished about 474. He wrote *Lives of the Roman Emperors*, to A.D. 474. The work was highly commended by John Malala; but it is lost.

Johannes Ægeates, a Nestorian; flourished A.D. 483, or later; and wrote an Ecclesiastical History, in ten books; of which (says Photius) the first five books reached from A.D. 428 to 479. Only some extracts of it remain.

but immoderately laborious in extending the limits of his power.¹ *Orosius* is famous for his *history*, written to confute the cavils of the pagans, and for his books against the Pelagians and Priscillianists.²

Sabas, a Syrian monk and abbot, born in 439, died 531. He wrote a *Typicus*, or the order of prayer for the whole year; which was adopted in all the monasteries about Jerusalem, and is still extant.

Justin, a bishop in Sicily, A.D. 484; author of some Epistles, and (as Dodwell supposes,) of the *Questiones ad Orthodoxos*, published among the works of Justin Martyr.

Æneas Gazæus, a sophist and a Platonist, and then a Christian; flourished about A.D. 488. He was the author of a noted Dialogue, entitled *Theophrastus*, or, on the Immortality of Souls, and the Resurrection of the Body; ed. Gr. and Lat., by Barth, Lips. 1658, 4to.

Athanasius junior, or Celetes; bishop of Alexandria A.D. 490—497; a fine biblical scholar, an active and good bishop, and a devout man. He is supposed to be the author of several of the works ascribed to Athanasius the Great, and published as such; namely, 1. *Sacra Scripturæ Synopsis*; 2. *Questiones et Responsiones ad Antiochum*; 3. the two tracts, *de Incarnatione Verbi Dei*; 4. *Syntagma Doctrinæ, ad Clericos et Laicos*; 5. *de Virginitate, sive Asceti*.

Zacharias, a rhetorician; flourished A.D. 491. He wrote an Ecclesiastical History, from A.D. 450—491; which is often quoted, as well as censured for partiality, by Evagrius, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

Eustathius, of Syria; flourished A.D. 496. He wrote *Chronicorum Compendium*, from Æneas to Anastasius, or A.D. 496; in nine books, which are lost.

Malchus, a Byzantine sophist; flourished A.D. 496. He composed a Roman History, from Constantine the Great to the emperor Anastasius. Two large extracts only are extant.

Basil of Cilicia, first a presbyter at Antioch, and then bishop of Irenopolis in Cilicia; flourished A.D. 497. He wrote an Ecclesiastical History, in three books; extending from A.D. 450 to A.D. 527; also *Contra Johannem Scythopolitanum libri xvi.* accusing him of Manichæism. Neither work is extant.

Candidus, a scrivener to the governors of the province of Isauria; flourished A.D. 496. He wrote *Historiarum libri iii.* extending from A.D. 457 to A.D. 491. Some extracts by Photius are all that remain.

Andreas, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; flourished about A.D. 500. He wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse; which is extant, Gr. and Lat. inter *Opp.* Chrysostomi, tom. viii. ed. Morell.—also *Therapeutica*

Spiritualis; of which only some fragments remain. *Tr.*]

¹ The entire works of Leo I. [comprising 100 Sermons, and 141 Epistles,] were edited with great care, by the celebrated presbyter of the Oratory, Pasch. Quesnel. Lyons, 1700, 2 vols. fol. [This edition being proscribed by the pope, because the editor defended the cause of Hilary of Arles, and the liberties of the Gallican church, against Leo; a new edition was published by Cacciari and the brothers Ballerini.—Leo was a man of extraordinary talents, a good writer, an indefatigable bishop, and very successful in promoting the glory of the see of Rome. It has been said, that he possessed every virtue that was compatible with an unbounded ambition. He was bishop of Rome from 440 to 461. In the beginning of his reign, he persecuted the sectarians of Africa, who took refuge in Italy on the conquest of Africa by the Vandals. In 445 commenced his controversy with Hilary, archbishop of Arles, whom he divested of his rights as a metropolitan, in violation of the liberties of the Gallican church. He also obtained from Valentinian III. a decree confirming his usurpations over the Gallic church. In 451, he showed the violence of his passions and the excess of his ambition, by his opposition to the decree of the council of Chalcedon, which raised the bishop of Constantinople to the rank of a patriarch, and extended very much his jurisdiction. In 455, he was a protection to the city of Rome, when it was pillaged by Genserie, king of the Vandals. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xvii. 90—169; and A. Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, ii. 7—140. *Tr.*]

² Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, t. iii. voce *Orose*. The works of Orosius have at length been published, with some medals, by Sigb. Havercamp, Leyden, 1738, 4to.—[Paul Orosius was a presbyter of Tarragona in Spain. In 413, he was sent into Africa, to consult Augustine respecting the rising sect of the Priscillianists. Augustine now put him upon writing his history; which he completed four years afterwards. In 415, Augustine sent him to Palestine, to visit Jerome, and learn his opinion respecting the origin of souls. He was present at some councils in Palestine; and there exposed the errors of Pelagius. On his return to Africa, he brought with him the relics of St. Stephen, which were highly valued. He afterwards returned to Spain. The time of his death is unknown. His works, written in good Latin, comprise,

Cassian, an ignorant and superstitious man, by his discourse, institutions, and writings, instructed the Gauls in the mode of living pursued by the monks of Syria and Egypt, and was a leading teacher among those denominated Semi-Pelagians.¹ The *Homilies* of *Maximus* of Turin, which are still extant, are short, but generally neat and pious.² *Eucherius* of Lyons is not the last among the Latins of this century, who treated moral subjects eloquently and well.³ *Pontius* of Nola, highly esteemed by the ancients for his piety, has recommended himself to posterity by his poems, and by some other things.⁴ *Peter*, bishop of Ravenna, acquired the surname of *Chrysologus*, on account of his eloquence; and his discourses are not entirely destitute of genius.⁵ *Salvian*, an eloquent writer, but gloomy and austere,

1. *Historiarum adversus Paganos libri vii.*; in which he endeavours to show from the Roman history, that as great calamities had happened in the empire under the reign of paganism, as under that of Christianity. 2. *Apologeticus contra Pelagianos de arbitrii libertate*. These two works are in the edition of Havercamp. 3. His written statement to Augustine, in the year 413, which is published among the works of Augustine, and is entitled, *Commonitorium sive Consultatio ad S. Augustinum, de Errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum*. Tr.]

¹ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 215. &c. Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiast.* par M. du Pin, i. 156. The works of Cassian, with a prolix Commentary, were published by Alard. Gazeus; latest ed. Francf. 1722, fol.—[John Cassian of Seythian descent, was born at Athens A.D. 351. He early devoted himself to a monastic life; which he pursued first at Bethlehem, then at Nitria in Egypt, next at Constantinople, where Chrysostom made him deacon of a church. On the banishment of Chrysostom, A.D. 404, the clergy of Constantinople sent Cassian to Italy, to solicit aid to their cause from the pope. At Rome, Cassian was ordained a presbyter; and there he remained till A.D. 410, when, on the capture of Rome by the Goths, he retired to Marseilles. Here he erected two monasteries, one for males and one for females; and thenceforth devoted himself to the furtherance of monkery in Gaul. He began to write in 424, and died A.D. 448, aged 97 years. He was not a great man, but active, pious, and sincere. He was a leading man among the Semi-Pelagians; and held, perhaps, nearly the same sentiments respecting original sin, and grace, and human ability, with the Remonstrants or Arminians of Holland in the seventeenth century. His works are, 1. *de Institutis Canobiorum libri xii.*; of which the four first books describe the form and

regulations of a monastery; and the eight following treat of as many principal sins.

2. *XXV. Collationes Patrum*; discourses, or rather Colloquies, chiefly on monastic virtues. 3. *De Christi Incarnatione adversus Nestorium*, libri vii. Tr.]

² [Maximus was bishop of Turin from 422 to 466. Little is known of his life. His works consist of eighty-five short Homilies or sermons. Of these, thirty-two were published among the works of Ambrose; and eight among the discourses of Augustine. Theoph. Raynaud collected and published seventy-three of them under the name of the real author, in a volume containing the works of Leo I. and of Peter Chrysologus; Lyons, 1652, and Paris, 1671, fol. Afterwards, Mabillon collected twelve more; which he published in his *Museum Italicum*, tom. i. pt. ii. p. 1, &c. And Bruno Bruni published the whole, Rome, 1784, fol. Tr.]

³ Concerning Eucherius, the Benedictine monks treat largely, in *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 275. [He was of an honourable family in Gaul, fond of monkery in his youth, and resided some time in a monastery in an island near Lerins. But he afterwards married, and had two sons, Salonius and Veranius, who became bishops. He was bishop of Lyons from 434 to 454. His most admired work is his Epistle to Valerianus, *On Contempt of the World and Secular Philosophy*. Besides this, he wrote in praise of monkery; instructions for his sons; and several Homilies. Several works are falsely ascribed to him. The whole were published, Basil, 1631, and Rome, 1564, 4to, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* vi. Tr.]

⁴ [Paulinus. Tr.]

⁵ See the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 179. The works of Paulinus were published by J. Bapt. le Brun, Paris, 1685, 2 vols. 4to. [See cent. iv. pt. ii. c. 2, § 10. Tr.]

⁶ See Agnelli, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesie*

who, in the vehemence of his declamation against the vices of the times, unwarily discloses the weakness and defects of his own character.¹ *Prosper* of Aquitaine,² and *Marius Mercator*,³ can scarcely be unknown to any one who has paid some attention to the Pelagian and other controversies of this century. *Vincent* of Lerins has continued his name to posterity, by a short but eloquent tract against the sects, which he entitled *Commonitorium*.⁴ I designedly pass over

Ravennatensis, i. 321, ed. Bachinii.—[Peter Chrysologus was an Italian, of a noble family. He was born at Imola, and educated under the bishop of that see. In 433, he was made bishop of Ravenna, where he died about 450. He has left us 147 short Homilies or Sermons; and one Epistle, addressed to Eutyches the heretic in 449. His works have been often published; the latest edition is, perhaps, that of Venice, 1742, fol. *Tr.*]

¹ See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 517. [The authors of the history here referred to, give a different account of Salvian's character. They acknowledge that his declamation against the vices of the age, in his *Treatise against Avarice*, and his *Discourse concerning Providence*, are warm and vehement; but they represent him notwithstanding as one of the most humane and benevolent men of his time.] *Macl.*—Salvian was a native of Gaul, probably of Cologne; lived long at Treves, and married a pagan lady, who, however, became a Christian after marriage; had one child, a daughter. At length he removed to the south of France, and became a presbyter of Marseilles, where he lived to a great age. He flourished as early as 440; but was alive, though an old man, in 495. See Gennadius (who was a contemporary presbyter of Marseilles), *de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 67. The works of Salvian now extant are, 1. *On the Providence and Government of God*, and *His righteous temporal Judgments*, eight books. 2. *Nine Epistles*. 3. *Against Avarice, especially in clergymen and bishops*, four books. His style is barbarous, yet vivid and energetic. His conceptions are clear, his reasoning pungent, and his sentiments for the most part correct. Yet his descriptions are coarse, and often too highly coloured, and his positions sometimes untenable. The works of Salvian have been often published. The best edition is that of Steph. Baluze, Paris, 1669, 8vo. *Tr.*]

² For a good account of Prosper, see the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 369.—[Tiro Prosper, a layman, but a learned theologian, of Aquitaine, flourished A.D. 444. He was a great admirer and an able defender of the doctrines of Augustine, respecting original sin, predestination, and free grace. In 426,

he addressed a letter to Augustine, acquainting him with the incipient progress of Pelagian errors in Gaul, and soliciting him to write against them. In 431, he visited Italy, to procure the aid of the pope against these errors; and returned strengthened by a doctrinal letter addressed to the bishops of Gaul. In 433, he wrote his strictures on the thirteenth *Collatio* of John Cassianus, which is an able performance. In 443, Leo I. called him to Rome, and made him his private secretary, and employed him in the Pelagian contests of Italy. He was alive in 455; but the time of his death is unknown. He was a man of strong reasoning powers, soundly orthodox, and a good model in controversial writing. Most of his works are in defence of the doctrines of original sin, predestination, and free grace; and especially his two books (if indeed they are his), *de Vocatione Gentium* (on the offer of salvation to all men), will be read with interest by the modern theologian. He also composed a *Chronicon*, continuing that of Eusebius down to 455; a Commentary on the last fifty Psalms; several letters, and some poems. His works were published, Paris, 1711, fol., and by Salina, Rome, 1732, 8vo. *Tr.*]

³ [Marius Mercator was probably an African, yet may have lived some time in Italy. He was undoubtedly a layman, a friend and admirer of Augustine, and an active defender of his doctrines from 418 to 451. His works are almost wholly translations from the Greek fathers, particularly Nestorius, Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, Proclus, Theodoret, &c., accompanied with prefaces and notes or strictures by the translator. They are all designed to confute either the Nestorian or the Pelagian errors; and were edited with copious notes by Joh. Garnier, Paris, 1673, fol., and still better by Steph. Baluze, Paris, 1684, 8vo. *Tr.*]

⁴ A good account of Vincentius of Lerins, is found in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 305. [He was born of a noble family at Toul, in Lorraine; became a soldier, and afterwards a monk at Lerins, where he was made a presbyter. He flourished A.D. 434, and died before 450. He has been called a Semi-Pelagian; from having drawn up *Objections against the writings and doctrines*

Sidonius Apollinaris, a tumid writer, though not destitute of eloquence; ¹ *Vigilius* of Tapsus; ² *Arnobius* Junior, who commented on

of *Augustine*, which (though lost) are confuted by Prosper of Aquitain. His only surviving work is his *Communitorium adversus Hæreticos*. This he re-wrote, but lost the copy, and therefore added notes to the first draft. It is an attempt to confute all heresies at once, by showing what are the marks of the true church, as distinguished from all errorists. It has been often published; e. g. by Baluze, subjoined to *Salvian's* works, Paris, 1669, 8vo, and Cambridge, 1687, 12mo. *Tr.*—*Vincent's Communitorium* was re-published at Oxford in 1836, and an English translation of it, revised from one published in 1651, was printed there in the following year. It contains a famous test of Catholicity, to which Protestants have often appealed as conclusive against Romanism. *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est, hoc est vere proprièque Catholicum, quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat.* Protestants consider Romanists unable to fix their peculiar tenets among articles of the Catholic faith, from a failure of proof as to reception *everywhere, always, and by all.* *S.]*

¹ [C. Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius was born of a noble family at Lyons, A.D. 431. His father and grandfather both bore the name of Apollinaris, and both were prætorian præfects of the Gauls. After an expensive education, he became a soldier, married the daughter of Avitus, who was afterwards emperor, had three children; was captured at the siege of Lyons, A.D. 457; yet was advanced to honour by the new emperor Majorianus, whom he eulogized in 458; had a statue erected to him, and was advanced to the dignity of count. In 467, he went to Rome as legate from the city of Clermont; pronounced an eulogy on the emperor Anthemius; was made *prefect* of Rome, and performed his duties so faithfully, that he had another statue decreed him, was made a *patrician* and a *senator* of Rome. In 472, he was almost compelled to accept the office of bishop of Clermont. He now laid aside all his civil honours, gave up his property to his son, and devoted himself to sacred studies and to his episcopal functions. His influence among the clergy and the churches was very great. When the Goths attacked Clermont, he put himself at the head of the citizens as their military commander; and when the city was captured in 480, he retired in safety, was restored to his see, and died in 482. He has left us numerous Epistles, which he himself digested into nine books; in which form they are published, with one Sermon,

and twenty-four poetic effusions interspersed. Several of his works, in prose and verse, are lost. His works were published by Jac. Sirmond, Paris, 1614, 8vo, and, with additional notes, Paris, 1652, 8vo. His Epistles are useful, as throwing light on the history of his times. *Tr.]*

² [Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus, in Africa, flourished A. D. 484, at which time he was summoned to appear at Carthage before Hunneric, the Arian king of the Vandals, and give account of his faith. He boldly professed orthodoxy; but the persecution which followed obliged him to quit Africa, and he retired to Constantinople, and, after some years, removed to Italy, where he composed several, perhaps the greater part, of his works. To conceal himself from his persecuting enemies, he composed much under borrowed names, and especially that of Athanasius. During the middle ages, he was confounded with Vigilius of Trent, who flourished at the beginning of this century. His works are, five books against Nestorius and Eutyches; two Dialogues between Athanasius and Arius, supposed to have been held at the council of Nice; three Dialogues between the same; twelve books on the Trinity; a Dialogue on the Trinity, between Augustine and Felicianus, an Arian; on the Trinity, against Varimadus; one book against Palladius, an Arian; Answers to Arian objections; Dialogue between Augustine and Pascentius, an Arian. He is likewise supposed to be the author of that Confession of Faith, which is commonly called the *Athanasian Creed*. His works were first published as his by P. F. Chifflet, Dijon, 1664, 4to. *Tr.*—Quesnel, in a dissertation appended to Pope Leo's works, published by him in 1675, learnedly ascribes the Athanasian Creed to Vigilius Tapsensis, and that opinion, which was not absolutely new, henceforward was very commonly received. But Waterland has proved it unsound by internal evidence. The claim of Vigilius requires about 484 for a date, and the Creed seems to have been written before the council of Ephesus, in 431. Otherwise, it could hardly have wanted marks of an opposition to Nestorianism. From a deficiency of this kind, and from other evidence, Waterland concludes that the Creed was written in Gaul, between 420 and 430. Its author he conceives to have been Hilary, a famous divine of that age and country, once abbot of Lerins, eventually archbishop of Arles. Waterland's *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*. Works, iv. 136, 250, 261. *S.]*

the Psalms of David;¹ *Dracontius*;² and others,³ who were of a secondary rank.

¹ An account of Arnobius junior is given in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, ii. 342. [He is called *junior* to distinguish him from the African Arnobius, who lived at the beginning of the preceding century. This Arnobius junior is supposed to have lived in Gaul. He flourished about 461, and wrote a Commentary on the Psalms; Notes on some passages in the Gospels; and a Dispute with Serapion of Egypt, respecting the Trinity, the person of Christ, and the consistency of grace with free will. He was a Semi-Pelagian. His works are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* viii. 203, &c. *Tr.*]

² [Dracontius was a presbyter and a poet, probably of Spain, who flourished A.D. 440, and was alive in 450. He has left us a Heroic Poem on the Creation, or the Hexaëmeron; and an Elegy on Theodosius II.; both published by J. Sirmond, Paris, 1619, 8vo; and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. ix. p. 724, 729. *Tr.*]

³ [Catalogue of Latin writers omitted by Mosheim, extracted from the *Historia Literaria* of Dr. Cave.

Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, a friend of Rufinus, and a defender of Chrysostom; flourished A.D. 401, and died 410. He has left us some Homilies on the Beatitudes, Matt. v., and a few Epistles.

Innocent I., bishop of Rome, A.D. 402—417, a firm friend of Chrysostom, and strenuous against the Nestorians and Pelagians. Of 34 Epistles published as his, the genuineness of nearly all is questioned. [But see Jaffé, *Regesta Pontiff.* 22. *Ed.*]

Zosimus, of Greek extract, bishop of Rome A.D. 417, 418; famous for his attempt to subject the African churches to his see. He has left us 13 Epistles. [Jaffé, 27. *Ed.*]

Boniface, bishop of Rome, A.D. 418—423, prosecuted the attempt of Zosimus. We have 3 of his Epistles. [9 are noticed in Jaffé, 29. *Ed.*]

Severus, bishop of Minorca, flourished A.D. 418. His epistle, describing the conversion of the Jews of Minorca, was published by Baronius, *Annales*, ad ann. 418.

Julian, an Italian bishop, born before 386, and died about 440 or 450. He studied under Pelagius; became a deacon, lector, husband, and bishop of a small town among the Hirpini. In 417, he came out an open defender of Pelagianism; in 420 he was condemned; went to Constantinople, and thence to Cilicia, where he lived long with Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and devoted himself to writing in defence of his sentiments. In 423, he was condemned by a synod of Cilician bishops; returned to Italy in 424,

hoping to recover his see; failed, and went again to Constantinople, to beg the interference of the emperor; but here Mercator's *Commonitorium* to Theodosius II. met him, and blasted his prospects. Being driven from Constantinople, and condemned in a council at Rome, in 431, he pretended to renounce his errors, and applied to the pope in 439, to restore him to his see, but in vain. —He was a man of superior talents, well acquainted with the Scriptures, and so eloquent, that he was styled the Roman Demosthenes; and likewise famed for his piety and his benevolence to the poor. But he was accused of dissembling as to his sentiments, and of using bitter language towards his adversaries. Large extracts are preserved from his Epistles, his Commentary on the Canticles, and his twelve books against the first and second books of Augustine on Marriage.

Priscus Fastidius, a British bishop, flourished A.D. 420. He has left us a tract on Christian life and widowhood, addressed to a pious widow; extant among the works of Augustine, t. ix.

Evodius, bishop of Uzala, in Africa, an intimate friend of Augustine, flourished A.D. 420. Four of his Epistles to Augustine, and one book *de Fide contra Manicheos*, are extant, among the works of Augustine.

Isidorus, bishop of Cordova in Spain, flourished A.D. 420, and died A.D. 430. He was probably the author of four books of allegories, or commentaries on all the books of Kings, extant among the works of Isidorus Hispalensis.

Cælestine, bishop of Rome, A.D. 423—432, and active in the Nestorian contests. He has left us 14 Epistles. [16 in Jaffé, 31. *Ed.*]

Lupus, bishop of Troyes, flourished A.D. 427. He was sent by the Gallic bishops to Britain, in 429, to root out Pelagianism; was successful, and returned in 430, and died A.D. 479. He has been pronounced one of the greatest men of his age. Two of his Epistles are extant.

Possidius, or Possidonius, bishop of Calama, near Hippo, in Africa; flourished A.D. 430. He was an intimate friend of Augustine; and wrote his life, and a catalogue of his works, still extant among the works of Augustine.

Hilary, bishop of Arles, born A.D. 401, became a monk of Lerins, and was made bishop in 430, and died in 449. As metropolitan of Arles, he deposed Celidonius, bishop of Vienne, who appealed to Rome, and was supported by Leo I., which in-

volved Hilary in war with Leo all their lives. He wrote the *Life of St. Honoratus*, his predecessor; Heroic Poems on Genesis; one Epistle to Eucherius, of Lyons; two others to Augustine; and an account of the miracles of St. Genesius: all which were published by the Benedictines, Paris, 1693, fol., and by Joh. Salina, Rome, 1731, 8vo.

Capreolus, bishop of Carthage, flourished A.D. 431. His Epistle to the council of Ephesus, and another to two Spanish bishops, against Nestorius, are extant in Baronius, and in other Collections.

Patrick (St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland,) was born at Nenthur, (Kirkpatrick,) about 371; became a monk; was sent to Rome in 432, and there appointed apostle and archbishop of Ireland; returned to Ireland, and laboured successfully; went to England in 447, obtained many fellow labourers, and returning, spread Christianity far and wide in Ireland; he founded churches, ordained bishops, held councils, performed repeated miracles, and died A.D. 493, aged 122 years. He is reported to have founded 365 churches, and to have ordained as many bishops, besides 3,000 presbyters; and to have baptized 12,000 persons. His life is given in full in archbishop Ussher's *Ecclesiast. Britannic. Primordia*, cap. xvii. His works, consisting of epistles, canons, accounts of Irish synods, &c., were published (in part, by Wilkins, *Concil. Britannic.* tom. i. and) entire, by Ja. Ware, Lond., 1658, 8vo. [The preceding account of Patrick appears to be erroneous in many particulars, as may be seen in pt. i. c. 1, § 6, note. S.]

Sixtus II., bishop of Rome, A.D. 432—440, has left us several epistles [8 in Jaffé, 33]. The three books on *riches, chastity, false teachers, &c.*, are erroneously ascribed to him.

Adrian, who lived, perhaps, about 460, wrote an *Isagoge* (Introduction) in *S. Scripturam*; which is extant in the *Critici Londinenses*, t. viii.

Maximus, a Gallic monk, abbot of Lerins in 426, and bishop of Riez, in France, A.D. 433, lived till 451 or longer, and wrote several Homilies, which are extant among those of Eusebius of Emesa, and Eucherius of Lyons.

Claudius Marius Victor, or Victorinus, a rhetorician and poet of Marseilles; flourished A.D. 434, and died before A.D. 450. He wrote a *Poetic Commentary on Genesis*, to the death of Abraham; a poetic *Epistle to the abbot Solomon*, on the corrupt morals of the age; both extant, Paris, 1560, 8vo, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. viii. p. 580.

Cælius Sedulius, a [so called] Scot, and poet, who flourished A.D. 434. He studied in Italy, became a presbyter, and, perhaps, a bishop. His works were collected by Tur.

Ruf. Asterius, towards the close of this century; comprising *Carmen Paschale* (on the miracles of Christ), in five books; *Veteris et Novi Test. Collatio*, an Elegiac poem; *Pæan Alphabeticus de Christo*, in Iambic measure (on the life of Christ); and *Paschalis Operis libri v.* in prose. An *Exposition of all the Ep. of Paul* is falsely ascribed to him. The works of Sedulius have been published repeatedly, and are to be found in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vi.

Valerianus, a bishop in the maritime Alps; flourished A.D. 439, and was alive in 455. His 20 Homilies and an Epistle were published by Ja. Sirmond, Paris, 1612, 8vo; also in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tom. viii.

Eustathius, flourished A.D. 440, the neat Latin translator of St. Basil's nine Homilies on the Hexaëmeron; extant among the works of Basil the Great.

Philippus, a presbyter, and disciple of Jerome; flourished A.D. 440, and died A.D. 455. He wrote a *Commentary on Job*, in three books; published, Basil, 1527, 4to and fol. It has been ascribed both to Beda and to Jerome.

Idatius, or Hydatius, a Spanish bishop, who flourished A.D. 445, and died A.D. 468. He wrote a *Chronicon*, from 379 to 428; and afterwards continued it to 467; first published, entire, by Ja. Sirmond, Paris, 1619, 8vo; and since, in the works of Sirmond, Paris, 1696, and Venice, 1729. It is barbarous in style, and frequently inaccurate as to facts; yet affords valuable aid in tracing the movements of the Goths and Suevi.

Zacchæus, the reputed author of three books of discussion, between Zacchæus, a Christian, and Apollonius, a pagan, in regard to Christianity. The book was probably written about 450; and is published in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, t. x.

Salonius, son of Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, and himself a Gallic bishop, flourished A.D. 453. He wrote an *Exposition of the Proverbs of Solomon*; and a *Mystical Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*; both extant, in the *Orthodoxographia*, and in *Biblioth. Patr.* t. viii.

Victorius, or Victorinus, a Gallic mathematician, flourished A.D. 457; author of a *Paschal Canon*, in two parts; the first part exhibits the principles and the method of calculating Easter; the second is a table of Easter days, from A.D. 28 to 457. This Canon was recommended by the council of Orleans, A.D. 541, and was first published by Ægid. Bucherius, Antw. 1634, fol.

Hilarus, bishop of Rome, A.D. 461—467. He was the bishop of Rome's legate to the council of Ephesus in 449. Twelve of his Epistles are extant. [Jaffé, 48. *Ed.*]

Paulinus Petricordius, or Vesuntus, (i. e. of Besançon,) a Gallic poet, who flourished

A.D. 461, and is often confounded with Paulinus of Nola. He wrote *de Vita Sti Martini*, libri vi., an uninteresting poem, extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. vi., and published by Daunius, with notes, Lips. 1686, 8vo.

Claudianus Mamertus, a Gallic poet, a presbyter, and assistant to the bishop of Vienne; flourished A.D. 462. He wrote *de Statu Animi*, libri iii.; two Epistles; a *Poem against various errors*; and a *Hymn on the Crucifixion*; all extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. vii.

Simplicius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 467—483. He was much engaged in contests with the eastern patriarchs; and has left us nineteen Epistles; extant in *Concilia*, t. iv. [Jaffé, 49. *Ed.*]

Ruricius, senior, bishop of Limoges, in France; flourished A.D. 470, but was alive in 506. He has left us two books of Epistles; published by H. Canisius, *Antiq. Lectiones*, t. v. (or t. i. of new ed.) and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. viii.

Remigius, bishop of Rheims, 459—533. He baptized Clovis, with many of his lords; and has left us five Epistles, together with his Will. The Exposition of Paul's Epistles, attributed to him, is not his.

Faustus, abbot of Lerins, and then bishop of Riez, in France, A.D. 472—480, or 485; a Semi-Pelagian. His works are, *de Gratia Dei et Libero Arbitrio*, libri ii., with several Sermons, Epistles and Tracts; collected in *Biblioth. Patr.* t. viii.

Felix, bishop of Rome, A.D. 483—492; was much in controversy with the eastern patriarchs. Fifteen of his Epistles are extant. [Jaffé, 51. *Ed.*]

Victor Vitensis, an orthodox African bishop, who fled to Constantinople A.D. 487, and there composed a *History of the Persecutions in Africa*, under Genserik and Hunneric, kings of the Vandals. It was published with *Optatus Milevitanus*, Paris, 1659, 8vo; with Vigilius Tapsensis, Dijon,

1664, 4to; and in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. viii.

Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, bishop of Clermont, A.D. 490—523. He has left us five poetic books, *On the Creation and Fall of Man, the Flood, and the Passage of the Red Sea*; a poem in praise of *Virginity*; eighty-seven Epistles; and some Sermons; published by Ja. Sirmond, Paris, 1643; and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. ix.

Gelasius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 492—496. Sixteen of his Epistles [about 80, see Jaffé, 53. *Ed.*] and fragments of various other works, are extant. The famous decree of a Roman council, A.D. 494, *de Libris Canonicis, Ecclesiasticis, et Apocryphis*, ascribed to Gelasius, is of dubious authenticity.

Gennadius, a presbyter of Marseilles, flourished A.D. 495; and wrote *de Scripturis Ecclesiasticis*, or a catalogue of authors, continuing Jerome's catalogue, from 393 to 495. His book, *de Fide*, and his *Life of Jerome*, are also extant. But his eight books against all the heresies, his six books against Nestorius, his three books against Pelagius, his Tract on the Millennium, and his translations from the Greek fathers, are lost.

Rusticus Elpidius, physician to Theodoric, king of the Goths; flourished about 498; and has left twenty-four Epigrams on Scriptural facts, and a poem on the *Benefits of Christ*.

Julianus Pomerius, of Mauritania; a teacher of rhetoric at Arles, and a presbyter there; flourished A.D. 498. His eight books *de Anima*, and several smaller works, are lost. But his three books *de Vita Contemplativa*, are extant among the works of Prosper; to whom they have been wrongly ascribed.

[Symmachus, bishop of Rome, A.D. 498—514; famous for his excommunication of the emperor Anastasius; has left us twelve Epistles. [See Jaffé, 61. *Ed.*] *Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Many points in theology better ascertained—§ 2. Increase of superstition—§ 3. Interpretation of the Scriptures—§ 4. Most of the interpreters incompetent—§ 5. Some were more able—§ 6. State of dogmatic theology—§ 7. Theological disputants—§ 8. Their faults—§ 9. Hence supposititious books—§ 10. Moral writers—§ 11. Mystics—§ 12. Superstition of the Stylites—§ 13. Further defects of the moralists—§ 14. *Jerome's* controversy with *Vigilantius*—§ 15. Controversies respecting *Origen*.

§ 1. IN the controversies which in this century agitated nearly all Christendom, many points of theology were more fully explained, and more accurately defined, than they had been before. Thus it was with the doctrine concerning *Christ*, his person and natures; and those concerning the innate depravity of the human soul, the natural ability of men to live and act as the law of God requires, the necessity of divine grace in order to salvation, human liberty, and the like. For that devout and venerable simplicity of the first ages of the church, which made men believe when God speaks, and obey when he commands, was thought by the chief doctors of this age to be only fit for clowns. Many of those, however, who attempted to explain and illustrate these doctrines, rather opened ways for disputing than for believing wisely, and living religiously; nor did they so much explain divine mysteries, as involve them in the perplexing folds of subtleties, ambiguous terms, and nice distinctions. To this posterity owes that most abundant crop of ills, contentions, and animosities, which almost baffles human powers. It might be remarked, besides, that some, while pressing adversaries too far, incautiously fell into errors the opposite of theirs, but not less dangerous.

§ 2. The superstitious notions and human devices by which religion was before much clogged, were very considerably augmented. Innumerable supplicants implored the aid of blest spirits which were thought to live with God: no one censuring this preposterous piety.¹ Nor did the question, which afterwards occasioned much debate, namely, in what way the prayers of mortals could reach the ears of residents in heaven, present any difficulties to the Christians of those times. For they did not suppose the souls of saints to be so confined above, as to want means of visiting mortals at their pleasure, and of

¹ [Extracts containing calls upon the saintly dead, may be seen in the *Centurie Magdeburgenses*, cent. 4, col. 296. Nevertheless, the practice was so unauthorised, and liable to such palpable objection, from reasonable doubts as to the omniscience of

the spirits invoked, that the church was rather cautious in committing herself to it. Her first approaches were prayers to God, that the saints might be found intercessors, not prayers to the venerable dead themselves. S.]

travelling over various regions. Nowhere, however, were disembodied spirits believed to be more willing and frequent visitors, than in the places where their bodies were interred. And this opinion, which Christians had received from the Greeks and Romans, drew a great conflux of supplicants to the sepulchres of the saints.¹ The images of those who were in reputation for sanctity while alive, were now honoured with extraordinary devotion in several places; nor were those wanting who thought such figures kindly graced by the presence of the heavenly personages whom they represented: the very doctrine which pagan priests had formerly applied to statues of Jupiter and Mercury.² Than the bones of martyrs and the sign of the cross, hardly any thing was believed more powerful to repel the assaults of evil spirits, and calamities of every kind, or to heal, not only bodily diseases, but likewise those of the mind.³ On the public processions, the holy pilgrimages,⁴ the superstitious services paid by the living to the souls of the dead, the multiplication and extravagant veneration of temples, chapels, and altars, and innumerable other proofs of degenerate piety, I forbear to speak particularly. As no one in those times prohibited Christians from retaining and transferring the opinions of their pagan ancestors respecting the soul, heroes, demons, temples, and the like, and transferring them into their devotions; as no one proposed utterly to abolish the ancient pagan institutions, but only to alter them somewhat, and purify them; it was unavoidable, that the religion and worship of Christians should be contaminated by these faults. This also I will add, that the doctrine of some sort of fire to purge souls after death, which eventually gained so much wealth for the sacred order, now came forth with a publicity and authority hitherto unknown.⁵

¹ Lactantius, *Divinar. Instit.* lib. i. p. 164. Hesiod, *Opp. et Dier.* v. 122. With which compare Sulpitius Severus, *Epist.* ii. p. 371. *Dial.* ii. c. 13, p. 474. *Dial.* iii. p. 512. Æneas Gazæus, *Theophrastus*, p. 65. Macarius, in *Ja. Tollii Insignia Itineris Italici*, p. 197, and other writers of that age.

² *Clementina Homil.* x. in *Patr. Apostol.* t. i. 697. Arnobius, *adv. Gentes*, lib. vi. p. 254, &c. Casp. Barthius, *ad Rutilium Numantian.* p. 250.

³ Prudentius, *Hymn.* xi. *de Coronis*, p. 150, 151. Sulpitius Severus, *Epist.* i. p. 364. Æneas Gazæus, *Theophrastus*, p. 173, ed. Barth.

⁴ [These pilgrimages were then so common, that some Christians fell into absurdities truly ridiculous. They journeyed to Arabia, in order to see the *dunghill* on which the diseased Job sat, and to kiss the ground which had absorbed his blood; as Chrysostom describes it (*Homily v. to the Antiochians*), where he says, in his rhetorical way, that the dunghill of Job was more venerable than the throne of a king. *Schl.*]

⁵ On this subject, Augustine deserves especially to be consulted, *de Octo Quæstionibus ad Dulcitium Liber*, c. xiii. *Opp.* vi. 128; *de Fide et Operibus*, c. xvi. p. 182; *de Fide, Spe, et Caritate*, § 118, p. 222; *Exposition of Psalm xxxv.* § iii. &c. [The well-known passage of Virgil shows no less clearly than finely, the pagan origin of this purgatorial doctrine.

*Quin et, supremo cum lumine, vita reliquit,
Non tamen omne malum miseris, nec funditus omnes*

Corporeæ excedunt pestes; penitusque necesse est

*Multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris.
Ergo exercentur pœnis, veterumque malorum*

Supplicia expendunt. Aliæ panduntur inanes

*Suspensæ ad ventos; aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum eluatur scelus, aut exurit igni:
Quisque suos patimur Manes: exinde per amplum*

Mittimur Elysium, et pauci læta arva tenemus. *Æn.* vi. 735.

§ 3. The number of those who devoted their talents to the explanation of the Scriptures, was not so great as in the preceding century, when there was less of controversy among Christians; and yet the number was not small. I merely name such as expounded only one or a few books of Scripture, namely, *Victor* of Antioch, *Polychronius*, *Philo* of Carpathus, *Isidore* of Cordova, *Salonius*, and *Andreas* of Cæsarea. The two most distinguished interpreters of this century, and who explained a great part of the sacred volume, and not altogether without success, were *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrus, and *Theodore* of Mopsuestia. Both excelled in genius and learning, and would not follow in the footsteps of those who preceded them without some reason. The expositions of the former are before the public;¹ those of the latter lie concealed in the East, among the Nestorians, and are worthy, for various reasons, to see the light.² *Cyril* of Alexandria deserves a place among the interpreters; but a far more honourable one is due to *Isidore* of Pelusium, whose epistles contain various things extremely useful for understanding and explaining the sacred books.³

§ 4. Most of these interpreters, whether Greek or Latin, constantly re-echo *Origen's* old note, and hunt for abstruse meanings, or, as the Latins of those times commonly say, *mysteries*, in the plainest expressions and sentences, taking no notice whatever of the force and power in the words themselves. Some of the Greeks, indeed, and in particular *Theodoret*, laboured not unsuccessfully in explaining the pages of the New Testament: which we may ascribe to their acquaintance with the Greek language, with which they had been familiar from their infancy. But upon the Hebrew Scriptures, neither the Greeks nor the Latins cast much light. Nearly all who attempted to explain them, making no use of their judgment, applied the whole either to *Christ* and his benefits, or to *Anti-Christ* and his wars and desolations, and to the kindred subjects.

§ 5. Here and there one, however, more sagacious and wiser than the rest, ventured to point out a safer path. This is evident from the Epistles of *Isidore* of Pelusium, who in various places censures, in a pertinent manner, such as, disregarding the *historic* sense, referred all

That the *lingering infection of human wickedness was to be burnt out by fire*, became at length the prevailing hypothesis. Christians were Scripturally taught, 2 *Pet.* iii. 10, to expect a final conflagration, and pagan prepossessions led them to give this the same purifying properties that had been usually given to the Deluge, only much more complete. One opinion was, accordingly, that all mankind will have to pass through the final conflagration to judgment, and will suffer more or less individually, in proportion to the degrees of iniquity waiting to be burnt out. In time, the difficulties in the way of this hypothesis displaced it by the general belief of a permanent purgatory, in which the process of *burning out*

worldly pollution may be constantly going on. *S.*]

¹ See Rich. Simon, *Histoire Critique des Principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Test.* cap. xxii. p. 314, and *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiast.* de M. du Pin, i. 180 [cent. v. pt. ii. c. ii. § 10, p. 338.]

² Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental.* Clement. Vaticana, tom. iii. § ii. p. 227. Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclésiast.* par M. du Pin, t. i. 108, 677. [See cent. v. pt. ii. c. ii. § 10, p. 339. *Tr.*]

³ Concerning both, see Rich. Simon, *Histoire des Principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Test.* c. xxi. p. 300, &c. [For some account of Cyril and Isidore, see cent. v. pt. ii. c. 2, § 10, pp. 337, 339. *Tr.*]

the narrative and prophetic parts of the Old Testament to *Christ*; and yet he himself was by no means entirely free from the fault of his age — the love and pursuit of allegories. No one went further in censuring the imitators of *Origen* than *Theodore* of Mopsuestia. He not only wrote a book *concerning allegory and history against Origen*,¹ but also, in his own *Commentaries* on the Prophets of the Old Testament, ventured to explain most of their predictions with reference to events in ancient history.² And this his method of explaining the Old Testament perhaps raised as much ill-will against him, as those other sentiments which brought on him the charge of heresy. The example of this excellent man was followed especially by the Nestorians;³ nor have they yet ceased to follow it, for they preserve his books with care, and venerate him as a saint of the highest order.

§ 6. It is very evident that the doctrines of religion were not exhibited with sufficient purity and simplicity by most persons; but were sometimes drawn out, with a zeal little to be commended, beyond the limits which divine revelation assigns to them; were anatomised with too much art and subtlety; and were substantiated, not so much by the declarations of the Holy Scriptures, as by the authority and logical reasonings of the ancient doctors. I know of no one who embraced a complete system of Christian doctrines in a single work, unless we may choose to say this of *Nicæas* of Romacia, in the *six books of instruction for Neophytes*, which he is said to have composed.⁴ But it has been already observed, that various doctrines of religion were laboriously explained, especially in the controversial works against the Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, and Arians.

§ 7. Of controversial writers, a great number can be mentioned: and, indeed, many of this description were required by the many contests that existed. The worshippers of the pagan images and gods were vigorously assailed by *Theodoret*, in his book, *De curandis Græcorum affectionibus*, which displays much genius and erudition; by *Orientius*, in his *Commonitorium*; and by *Evagrius*, in his *Disputation* between *Zachæus* and *Apollonius*.⁵ To these may be added

¹ Facundus Hermianensis, *de Tribus Capitulis*, lib. iii. c. 6. Liberatus, *Breviarium*, c. xxiv.

² *Acta Concilii Constantinop. II. seu Ecumenici V. Concilia*, ed. Harduin, iii. 58.

³ One witness, among others, is Cosmas Indicopleustes, a writer of the sixth century, who is known to have been a Nestorian. For he says, in his *Topographia*, lib. v. (p. 224, 225, of the *Collectio nova Patrum Græcor.* published by Bernh. Montfaucon), 'Among all the Psalms of David, only four refer to *Christ*;' and to confirm this sentiment, he does not hesitate to declare (p. 227), 'That the writers of the New Testament, when they apply the prophecies of the Old Testament to Jesus

Christ, follow the words rather than the sense.' [See also Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* v. 880. Tr.]

⁴ Gennadius Massiliens. *de Scriptoribus Ecclesiast.* cap. 22, p. 14, ed. Fabric. [The work is lost; but from the account of Gennadius, it was no *System of Theology*. Tr.—Du Pin, in his *New Eccl. Hist.* iii. 120, has a translation of the account which Gennadius gives of this author's work. He is described as 'bishop of some town in Romania.' S.]

⁵ For an account of Orientius and Evagrius, see the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, ii. 121, and 252. [Orientius, called also Orontius, and Oresius, was bishop of Auch in France, perhaps also of Tarragona in Spain [of Eliberis. Cave]. His *Commoni-*

Philip of Side and *Philostorgius*; of whom the former wrote against *Julian*, and the latter against *Porphyrus*.¹ The Jews were confuted by *Basil* of Seleucia;² by *Gregentius*, in his *Disputation with Iherbanus*; and by *Evagrius*, in his *Dialogue between Theophilus and a Jew*. Against all the heretics, something was attempted by *Voconius*, an African; by *Syagrius*, in his tract *de Fide*; by *Genaulius* of Marseilles; and, best of all, by *Theodoret*,³ in his work *de Fabulis Hereticorum*. Those who attacked only individual sects are here omitted.

§ 8. Such of these as contended against the Christian sectarists, followed the rules of the ancient sophists, and also (what is truly surprising) the practice of the Roman courts, rather than the examples and instructions of *Christ* and his apostles. In the Roman courts, very difficult and doubtful points were decided according to the opinions of certain ancient jurists. If these happened to disagree, that opinion was preferred which was maintained by the greatest number, or by the jurists of most learning and reputation.⁴ It was very prejudicial to the interests of truth, that this usage of the Roman courts was adopted as a rule in the controversies of Christians on subjects of religion, and followed in the deliberations of the councils of this century. For, by it, *that* was sanctioned and regarded as confirmed, which had been judged true and certain by the major part, or by the most learned and distinguished, of the doctors in former times. This appears from nearly all the Acts of Councils now extant. The other faults of the theological disputants may be easily inferred from what has now been stated.

§ 9. This imitation, in religious controversies, of the practice among Roman jurists, greatly inflamed the wicked audacity of those who did not blush to palm their own spurious productions on the great men of former times, and even on *Christ* himself and his apostles, so that they might be able, in the councils and in their books, to oppose names against names, and authorities against authorities. The whole Christian church was, in this century, overwhelmed with these disgraceful fictions. And this, it is said, occasioned the Roman pontiff, *Gelasius*, to assemble at Rome a convention of bishops, from all the Latin world, and after examining the books which were professedly the works of persons of the highest authority, to draw up that famous decree, by which so many *apocryphal* books are completely stripped of reputation. That something of this kind was actually done, can-

torium, which is written in heroic verse, was published, book I. by Martin Delrio, Antwerp, 1600, and book II. by Edm. Martene, in his *Nova Collectio Operum Ecclesiast. Vet.* Paris, 1700. This Evagrius is not the noted Evagrius Scholasticus of the sixth century, but was a French priest, and a disciple of St. Martin. His *Altercatio Simonis Judæi et Theophili Christiani* is found in Martene's *Anecdota*; and his *Consultationes, seu Deliberationes Zachæi Christiani et Apollonii Philosophi*, is in the

Spicilegium of D'Achery, tom. x. *Schl.*]

¹ [Neither of the works here mentioned is extant. *Tr.*]

² [For some account of this Basil, and of his writings, see note to the last chapter. *Tr.*]

³ [An account of Theodoret, and of his writings, is given in note to the last chapter. *Tr.*]

⁴ See *Codex Theodosianus*, lib. i. tit. iv. *de Responsis Prudentum*, p. 32, ed.^o Ritter.

not well be denied; but men of superior learning maintain, that this pretended decree of *Gelasius* is of no better authority than those books which it condemns; that is, they believe it not the production of *Gelasius*, but of some one who abused his name.¹

§ 10. Among those who treated on the subject of morals, *Eucherius*, *Salvian*, and *Nilus*, stand conspicuous. The epistle of *Eucherius* especially, on *Contempt of the world and secular philosophy*, will recommend itself to every good man, both from style and matter. The short pieces of *Mark*, the hermit, breathe a spirit of piety; but do not please, either by choice of subjects, or arrangement, or, in short, by weight of reasoning. *Fastidius* composed various tracts concerning moral duties and virtues, which are all lost.² The productions in this department of *Diadochus*, *Prosper*, and *Severianus*, are interesting, with a few exceptions, for the truth and terseness of the thoughts; but will afford little satisfaction to one fond of solid argumentation and well-digested composition. Indeed, it was a fault common to nearly all the moral writers of those times, that they had no idea of a regular distribution of their subject into parts, or of tracing it back to its first principles.

§ 11. This fault might indeed be put up with, and be ascribed to the infelicity of the times, by the more candid; but we see other injuries done to the cause of piety by inconsiderate men. In the first place, the *mystics*, as they are called, who pretended to be more perfect than other Christians, drew many everywhere among the weak and thoughtless, especially in the eastern provinces, who were allured by the appearance of their extraordinary and self-denying piety, to become of their party. And it is incredible what rigorous and severe laws they imposed on themselves, in order to appease God, and deliver the *celestial spirit* from the body's bondage. To live among wild beasts,—nay, in the *manner* of these beasts; to roam about like madmen, in desert places, and without garments; to feed their emaciated bodies with hay and grass; to shun the converse and even the sight of men; to stand motionless in certain places, for many years, exposed to the weather; to shut themselves up in confined cabins, till life ended;—this was accounted piety, this the true method of eliciting the [spark of] Deity from the secret recesses of the soul.³ The greater part of these people were influenced, not so much by arguments and assignable reasons, as by either a natural

¹ Jo. Pearson, *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, pt. i. c. iv. p. 189, &c. Wm. Cave, *Historia Litter. Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* p. 260. Urb. Godofr. Siberus, *Præf. ad Enchiridion Sexti*, p. 79, and others. [This decree is ascribed, by most of the MSS., to *Gelasius I.*; but by some to *Damasus*, and by others to *Hormisdas*. It is not quoted by any writer before the ninth century. It mentions some books which were not in being in the age of *Gelasius*; and it contains some sentiments and arguments which savour of a later age. It may be found in, perhaps, all the

larger collections of Councils; in *Binnius*, vol. ii., in *Labbé*, vol. iv., in *Harduin*, vol. ii., in *Mansi*, *Supplem.* vol. i., also in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Decret. *Gratian*, pt. i. *Distinct.* xv. cap. iii. *Tr.*]

² [Except his tract *On a Christian Life and Widowhood*, addressed to a pious widow, which is preserved among the works of *Augustine*, t. ix. *Tr.*]

³ See *Moschus*, *Pratum Spirituale*; *Palladius*, *Historia Lausiaca*; *Sulpitius Severus*, *Dial.* i. and others.

propensity to melancholy and austerity, or by the example and opinions of others. For there are diseases of the mind, as well as of the body, which spread like a pestilence. Yet there were some who gave systematic precepts for this austere mode of living; for instance, among the Latins, *Julianus Pomerius*, in his three books *de vita contemplativa*; and, among the Syrians, many whose names it is needless to mention.

§ 12. Among these examples of religious fatuity, none acquired greater veneration and applause than those who were called *Pillar-Saints* (*Sancti Columnares*), or in Greek, *Stylite*; persons of a singular spirit and genius, who stood motionless on the tops of lofty columns, during many years, even to the end, in fact, of life, to the great astonishment of the ignorant multitude. This scheme originated in the present century with *Simeon* of Syzan, a Syrian; at first a shepherd, then a monk; who, in order to be nearer heaven, spent thirty-seven years in the most uncomfortable manner, on the tops of five different pillars, of six, twelve, twenty-two, thirty-six, and forty cubits elevation; and in this way procured for himself immense fame and veneration.¹ His example was afterwards followed, though not

¹ See the *Acta Sanctor.* January, t. i. 261, &c. where is expressly stated (p. 277) the very reason I have mentioned for his living in this manner. Theodoret also indicates the same by saying, that Simeon desired gradually to increase the altitude of his pillar, that he might get nearer to heaven. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, &c. xv. 347, ed. Paris. The *Acta S. Simeonis Stylite* are most fully related in Steph. Euod. Asseman's *Acta Martyrum Oriental. et Occidental.* ii. 227, Rome, 1748, fol. [This Simeon, we are told, was born at Syzan in Syria, about 390. At the age of thirteen, while tending his father's sheep, he heard a public exposition of Luke vi. 21, 25 ('Blessed are ye that weep now, &c. But woe unto you that laugh now, &c.'), which determined him to become a monk. Having therefore passed a novitiate of two years, he removed to a monastery near Antioch, where he lived ten years. Here his abstinence and his voluntary mortifications were so excessive, as to draw on him censure from the other monks. He once swathed himself from his loins to his neck, with a rigid well rope of palm during ten days, which caused his whole body to fester and discharge blood. Being expelled the monastery for such austerities, he retired to the adjacent mountain, and let himself down into a dry cave. After five days, the repenting monks sought him out, drew him forth from the cavern, and restored him to their fellowship. But not long after, he retired to a little cell, at the foot of a mountain near Antioch, and there immured himself three years. During this period,

having caused his den to be stopped up with earth, he remained buried for forty days, without eating or drinking; and when disinterred, was found nearly dead. So pleased was he with this experiment, that he afterwards kept such a fast annually, as long as he lived. He next removed to the top of the mountain; where he chained himself to a rock for several years. His fame had now become very great: and crowds of admiring visitors, of all ranks and characters, thronged around him. He instructed them, healed their diseases, and converted heretics, pagans, and Jews, in great numbers. Incommoded by the pressure of the crowd, he erected a pillar on which he might stand; elevated, at first, six cubits; then twelve, twenty-two, thirty-six; and, at last, forty cubits. The top of the pillar was three feet in diameter, and surrounded with a balustrade. Here he stood, day and night, and in all weathers. Through the night, and till nine A.M., he was constantly in prayer, often spreading forth his hands, and bowing so low that his forehead touched his toes. A bystander once attempted to count the number of these successive prostrations, and he counted till they amounted to 1244. At nine o'clock A.M. he began to address the admiring crowd below, to hear and answer their questions, to send messages and write letters, &c.; for he took concern in the welfare of all the churches, and corresponded with bishops and even with emperors. Towards evening he suspended his intercourse with this world, and betook himself again to converse with God till the following day. He generally ate

equalled, by many persons in Syria and Palestine; either from ignorance of true religion, or from love of fame, even down to the twelfth century, when this stupid form of religion was entirely abolished.¹ The Latins had wisdom enough to keep them from copying the Syrians and orientals in this matter. When, accordingly, one *Wulfilaicus* built himself such a pillar in the German territory of Treves, and wished to live upon it in the manner of *Simeon*, the neighbouring bishops pulled it down, and forbade the man to pursue his object.²

§ 13. Those who undertook to instruct the less advanced in Christian knowledge, were at more pains to inculcate and recommend the external signs of religion and exercises of the body, than to promote that real holiness which has its seat in the soul. Many, accordingly, so went beyond all bounds, that they required an extreme of *austere virtue*, little short of the ill-advised piety of the *mystics*. According to the sentiments of *Salvian* and others, no one can become truly and perfectly holy, unless he abandons altogether his property and honours, contemns matrimony, banishes all hilarity from his mind, and subjects his body to a variety of mortifications and inconveniences. As there were few who could bear the severity of these rules, the veneration for men, either void of reason, or fanatical and piously foolish, whose temperament was fit for these habits, increased wonderfully, and saints sprang up like mushrooms.

§ 14. A few, indeed, were bold enough to cut up growing superstition by the roots, and to call men away from a vain and fictitious piety to God's genuine service. But these were soon bidden to hold their peace, by others who were more numerous, in higher reputation, and possessed of greater influence.³ An example we have in *Vigilantius*, a presbyter of Gallic extraction, but resident in Spain, a learned and eloquent man. After a journey to Palestine and Egypt, returning home near the beginning of this century, he gave,

but once a week; never slept; wore a long sheepskin robe, and a cap of the same. His beard was very long, and his frame extremely emaciated. In this manner he is reported to have spent thirty-seven years; and at last, in his sixty-ninth year, to have expired unobserved, in a praying attitude, in which no one ventured to disturb him, till after three days; when Antony, his disciple and biographer, mounting the pillar, found that his spirit was departed, and his holy body was emitting a delightful odour. His remains were borne, in great pomp, to Antioch, in order to be the safeguard of that unwall'd town; and innumerable miracles were performed at his shrine. His pillar also was so venerated, that it was literally enclosed with chapels and monasteries for some ages. Simeon was so averse from women, that he never allowed one to come within the sacred precincts of his pillar. Even his own mother was debarred this privilege, till after

her death, when her corpse was brought to him; and he now restored her to life, for a short time, that she might see him and converse with him a little, before she ascended to heaven.—Such is the story gravely told us by the greatest writers of that age; and as gravely repeated, in modern times, by Roman Catholic historians. *Tr.*—Pagan India still supplies gloomy fanatics resembling Simeon, and admirers like his contemporaries; a plain proof that his austerities were a graft from gentilism, the great religious evil of his day, and still at work upon the Christian church. *S.*]

¹ See Urb. Godofr. Siber, *Diss. de Sanctis Columnaribus*, Lips. 4to, and Carol. Majell, *Diss. de Stylitis*; in Asseman's *Acta Martyr. Orient. et Occident.* ii. 246, where there is a copper-plate of Simeon's pillar.

² Gregor. Turonens. *Historia Francor.* lib. viii. c. xv. p. 387, &c.

³ Augustine himself complains of this in his noted *Epistle exix. ad Januarium*.

in several tracts, lessons and admonitions contrary to the opinions and habits of his age. Among other things, he denied that the tombs and the bones of the martyrs were worthy of any religious worship; and, therefore, he censured pilgrimages undertaken to places accounted sacred: he ridiculed the miracles which were said to take place in the temples consecrated to the martyrs; and condemned the practice of keeping vigils in them: he said that the custom of burning wax candles in the day time, at the sepulchres of the martyrs, was imprudently borrowed by Christians from the ancient superstition of the pagans: he maintained that prayers addressed to departed saints were fruitless: he treated with contempt the [prevailing] fasts, the celibacy of the clergy, and the monastic life: and he maintained that such as distributed all their goods among the poor, in order to live in voluntary poverty, and such as sent portions of their property to Jerusalem, did nothing pleasing and acceptable to God. These sentiments were not offensive to several of the Gallic and Spanish bishops. But the most renowned monk of that age, *Jerome*, attacked this bold religious reformer with so much acrimony, that he readily saw he must be silent, if he would regard his life and safety. This effort, therefore, to check the reigning superstition, was crushed in its commencement.¹ The good man's name still remains in the lists of *heretics*, which are recognised by those who follow not their own judgment, and that of Holy Scripture, but that of antiquity.

§ 15. The contests, moved in Egypt near the close of the preceding century, respecting *Origen*, were in this century prosecuted at the court of Constantinople, with little of either prudence or decency. The monks of Nitria, who were banished from Egypt, on account of *Origen*, took refuge at Constantinople, and were treated by *John Chrysostom*, the bishop of that city, with candour and kindness. As soon as this was known by *Theophilus* of Alexandria, he began to plot against *Chrysostom*; and, sending the renowned *Epiphanius* with several other bishops to Constantinople, he endeavoured to deprive that most eloquent prelate of his office. The time was a favourable one for his purpose; for *Chrysostom*, by the strictness of his discipline, and by the severity with which he lashed the vices of the times, and particularly those of some ladies of the court, had incurred the most violent resentment of many, and especially of *Eudoxia*, the wife of *Arcadius* the emperor. *Eudoxia*, therefore, inflamed by fury,

¹ Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique*, article *Vigilantius*. Jean Barbeyrac, *de la Morale des Pères*, p. 252. Gerh. Joh. Vossius, *Theses Historico-theologicæ*, p. 170. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 57, &c. [That *Vigilantius* was an honest and correct theologian, and that his name ought to be erased from the list of *heretics*, appears highly probable, from a candid examination of the whole subject. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iii. 673—704; and Vogel's *Disputation before Dr. Walch*, Gottingen, 1756, *de Vigilantio Hæretico Orthodoxo*. Tr.—As a

strong, though tacit proof of the prevailing rage for celibacy, *Vigilantius* said, that the bishops, hopeless otherwise of continence, would ordain none but married men deacons. (*Cent. Magd.* cent. iv. col. 603.) None of his writings are extant,—a fate which they could hardly escape from the established and increasing popularity of the principles and practices that they exposed. Enough, however, of them is known, to show that paganism did not gain firm footing in the church of Christ without remark or opposition. S.]

invited *Theophilus* and the Egyptian bishops to come to Constantinople, assemble a council, and inquire into the religion, morals, and official conduct of *Chrysostom*. This council, which was held in the suburb of Chalcedon in the year 403, and had *Theophilus* for its president, declared *Chrysostom* unworthy of the episcopal office, among other causes, on account of his too great attachment to *Origen* and the followers of *Origen*; and accordingly decreed his banishment. The people of Constantinople, who were exceedingly attached to their bishop, became tumultuous, and impeded the execution of this unjust sentence. But the tumult subsiding, the same judges, the next year, A.D. 404, in order to gratify their own enmity and that of *Eudoxia*, renewed their sentence under another pretext; and *Chrysostom* surrendering himself to his enemies, went into banishment at *Cucusus*, a city of Cilicia, where he died three years after.¹ His departure was followed by a great insurrection of the *Johannists* (for so his partisans were called), which the edicts of *Honorius* with difficulty suppressed.² That the proceedings against *Chrysostom* were most unjust, no one doubts; yet he had been wrong in this, that he determined to avail himself of the elevation decreed to the bishops of his see by the council of Constantinople, and to assume the prerogatives of a *judge* in the contest between *Theophilus* and the monks, which greatly exasperated the Alexandrian prelate. The monks of Nitria having lost their patron, sought a reconciliation with *Theophilus*; but the *Origenist* party still continued to flourish in Egypt, Syria, and the neighbouring countries, and made Jerusalem the home, as it were, and centre of the sect.³

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES AND RITES.

§ 1. Rites greatly augmented—§ 2. General description of them—§ 3. Love-feasts. Penitence.

§ 1. To recount all the regulations made in this century respecting the mode of worship, and religious rites and institutions, would require a volume of considerable size. The curious in these matters must examine the acts of councils, and the works left us by writers of more than ordinary celebrity. Among these there were, however, some

¹ See the authors referred to in the preceding century; to whom add the writers on the Life of *Chrysostom*, viz. Tillemont, Hermant, and others; and *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Crit.* i. 79, 80. [See also note, cent. iv. pt. ii. c. 2, § 9, and Soerates, *H. E.* vi. 9—18. Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 13—22. *Tr.*]

² See his three Laws, with the notes of God-froi, in the *Codex Theodosianus*, vi. 83, 113, &c.

³ See *Cyrilli Vita Sabæ*, in Cotelier, *Monumenta Eccles. Græcæ*, ii. 274. Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, ii. 31, &c.

who could not be so corrupted by the bad examples of their age, as to be kept from ingenuously acknowledging that true piety in the soul was oppressed by that enormous load of ceremonies. This evil originated, in part, from the degeneracy and indolence of the teachers; in part, from the calamities of the times, which were unfavourable to mental cultivation; and in part, from the innate depravity of man, which disposes him more readily to offer to God the service of his limbs and his eyes, than of his heart.

§ 2. Public worship assumed everywhere, more and more, a form calculated for show and for the gratification of the eye. Various ornaments were added to the sacerdotal garments, to increase the people's reverence for the sacred order. The new kinds of hymns, prayers, and supplications, could not easily be enumerated. In Gaul, particularly, were instituted the *Rogations*, or supplications, which precede the festal day of *Christ's* ascension.¹ In some places it was appointed that the praises of God should be sung perpetually day and night, the singers succeeding each other without interruption;² as if the Supreme Being took pleasure in clamour and noise, and in the flatteries of men. The magnificence of the temples had no bounds.³ Splendid images were placed in them; among which, after the Nestorian contests, a figure of *St. Mary* holding the infant in her arms, occupied the most conspicuous position. Altars, and coffers in which relics were kept, made of solid silver, if possible, were procured in all directions. From this may easily be conjectured what must have been the costliness of the other sacred furniture.

§ 3. On the contrary, the *Agapæ*, or Love-feasts, were abolished; because, as the ancient piety was daily more upon the decrease, they gave to many persons occasions for sin.⁴ Among the Latins, offenders

¹ See Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epist.* lib. v. ep. 16; and lib. vi. ep. 1. Martene, *The-saurus Anecdotor.* v. 47. [The three days immediately preceding Ascension-day, it is said, were first observed as days of public fasting, with solemn processions and supplications, by order of Claudius Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, in a time of great public calamity. Whether this was in 452, or 463, or 474, writers are not agreed. But the thing met approbation, was imitated, and repeated, till at length it became a law in the Latin church, that these days should be so observed, to secure a blessing on the fruits of the earth, and the temporal interests of men. The three days were called *Rogation Days*, and the week, *Rogation Week*, and the Sunday preceding, *Rogation Sunday*, from the *Rogations* or *Litanies* chanted in the processions of these days. *Tr.*]

² Gervais, *Histoire de Suger*, i. 23. [This custom probably originated in the East. There, in the beginning of the fifth century, one Alexander established, under the auspices of Gennadius, the patriarch of Constantinople, the Order of *Acemetæ* (*ἀκομητοί*),

or the *Sleepless*; who so regulated their worship, that it was never interrupted by day or by night; one class of the brethren succeeding another continually. This Order obtained afterwards the name of *Studites*, from a rich Roman counsellor of the name of *Studius*, who went to Constantinople, and erected a cloister appropriately for this Order. *Schl.*]

³ See an example in Zacharias of Mitylene, *de Opificio Mundi*, p. 165, 166.

⁴ [The abolition of the love-feasts was, in part, effected in the fourth century. The council of Laodicea [cir. 365], canon 28, first ordained, that they should no longer be held in the churches. A similar decree was passed, in 397, by the *third* council of Carthage, canon 20 [30]. Yet the custom was too firmly established to be at once rooted out. Hence we find, that in the times of Augustine, love-feasts were still kept in the churches. (Augustine, *contra Faustum*, l. xx. c. 20, 21. *Confess.* l. vi. c. 2, and *Epist.* lxiv.) Yet he there informs us, that all kinds of feasting had been excluded from the church by Ambrose. In

of the graver kind, who had before to confess their fault in public, were relieved from this unpleasant duty; for *Leo* the Great gave them liberty to make an acknowledgment of their crimes privately to a priest selected for that purpose. In this way was broken up the ancient discipline, that sole barrier of chastity and modesty, and priests, greatly to their interest, sate in judgment on the actions of mankind.¹

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SCHISMS AND HERESIES.

§ 1, 2, 3. Old heresies remaining. The Donatists—§ 4. State of the Arians—§ 5. Origin of the Nestorian sect—§ 6, 7. The occasion of it—§ 8. The council of Ephesus—§ 9. Opinion respecting this controversy—§ 10. Progress of Nestorianism after this council—§ 11, 12. Its propagator, Barsumas—§ 13. Eutyhian sect—§ 14. The council called *Conventus Latronum*—§ 15. Council of Chalcedon—§ 16. Subsequent contests—§ 17. In Syria and Armenia—§ 18. Troubles occasioned by Peter the fuller. Theopaschites—§ 19. The *Henoticon* of Zeno—§ 20. produces new contests among the Eutyhians—§ 21. among the defenders of the council of Chalcedon—§ 22. The doctrines of Eutyches and the Monophysites—§ 23. The Pelagian controversy—§ 24. Its progress—§ 25. The Predestinarians—§ 26. The Semi-Pelagians—§ 27. Various controversies concerning grace.

§ 1. SOME of the older sects, having gained new strength, became bold enough to disturb the church. I will pass in silence those

the Gallic churches, love-feasts were prohibited by the council of Orleans, A.D. 541; and as here and there some relics of them appeared in the seventh century, the council in *Trullo* [A.D. 692, can. 74] was induced to confirm the canon of the Laodicean council, by annexing the penalty of excommunication. *Schl.*]

¹ [That the strictness of the ancient discipline was greatly relaxed, admits no question. But that all public testimony against particular offenders, all public penances, and public censures, were commuted for *private* confession before priests, and for *private* penances (as Mosheim seems to intimate), is contrary to the voice of history. All *public* offenders, and all such as were *proved* guilty of gross crimes, were still liable to *public* censures. But the ancient practice of *voluntary* confession, before the church, of *private* offences and *secret* sins, had for some time gone into desuetude. Instead of such confessions before the church, in most places of both the East and the West, these *voluntary* confessions were made only to a priest, in private; and he directed the persons to such a course as he deemed proper. In some churches, however, in Campania and the vicinity, the practice was for the priests to

write down these voluntary disclosures; and if the persons were directed to do penance, their confessions were also read in public. It was to correct this *public* disclosure of *voluntary* confessions, that Leo I. in 460, wrote the Epistle to the bishops of Campania, Picenum, and Samnium, to which Mosheim refers. See his works, *Epist.* 130, or in some editions, ep. 80. It is cited also in Baronius, *Annales*, ann. 469, *sub finem*. The following is a literal translation. 'We also decide, that it is every way proper to rescind the practice, so contrary to the apostolic rule, which I learn has been lately followed by some. Let not written statements concerning the nature of the particular sins, be any longer rehearsed in public; since it is sufficient to disclose the accusations of the conscience to the priests, by a private confession. For although that abundance of faith may seem commendable, which, from reverence of God, does not hesitate to take shame before men, yet, as the sins of all are not of such a nature that the penitents have no fear to publish them, let this censurable practice be abolished; lest many should be kept back from doing penance, because they are either ashamed or afraid to disclose their deeds before their enemies, by whom they

inauspicious names of former days, the *Novatians*, *Marcionites*, and *Manichæans*, notwithstanding that a numerous progeny of them appeared in many places, and will confine my remarks to those two pests of the preceding century, the *Donatists* and the *Arians*.

The *Donatists* had hitherto enjoyed tolerable prosperity. But near the commencement of this century, the catholic bishops of Africa, led on principally by *St. Augustine*, of Hippo, put forth all their energies to crush and destroy this sect; which was not only very troublesome to the church, but also, through the *Circumcelliones*, who were its soldiers, pernicious to the commonwealth. Therefore in the year 404, the council of Carthage sent deputies to the emperor *Honorius*, petitioning that the imperial laws against heretics might be so extended as to embrace explicitly the *Donatists*, who denied that they were *heretics*; and likewise, that the fury of the *Circumcelliones* might be restrained.¹ The emperor, accordingly, first imposed a fine upon all *Donatists* who would not return to the church: their bishops and teachers he made liable to banishment.² In the following year, additional and more severe laws, usually called *Edicts of Unity*,³ were enacted against all *Donatists*. And as the magistrates were, perhaps, somewhat remiss in executing these laws, a council of Carthage, in the year 407, by means of another deputation to the emperor, both requested and obtained special executors of these *Edicts of Unity*.⁴

§ 2. The weakened party recovered strength and courage in the year 408, when *Stilicho* was put to death by order of *Honorius*; ⁵ and still more, in the year 409, when *Honorius* issued a law that no one should be compelled in matters of religion.⁶ But a council convened at Carthage, in the year 410, again sent a deputation to the emperor, and obtained a repeal of this law; ⁷ and likewise the appoint-

may be troubled with processes of law. For that confession is sufficient which is made first to God, and then also to the priest, whose business it is to pray over the sins of the penitents. For then more persons can be induced to do penance, if the [private] *consciousness* of the confessing person is not published in the ears of the people.' — See also Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, *Leo I.* ii. 124, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ [The documents of this transaction may be found in Mansi, *Collectio Conciliorum Ampliss.* iii. 1157, and in Harduin's *Collection*, t. i. in *Cod. Eccles. African.* can. 92, &c. p. 915, &c. and in Du Pin, *Monument. Vet. ad Donatist. Histor. pertinent.* p. 216. Compare also Augustine, *Ep.* 93, and, among the moderns, Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iv. 192, &c. *Schl.*]

² [Even before the arrival of the deputies from the council, the emperor had determined vigorously to persecute the *Donatists*, and to compel them to a union with their opposers, and had issued a law by which the refractory bishops and clergy were to be

banished, and the laity to be fined. The character of this law may be learned from Augustine, *Epist.* 185, § 25, &c. and *Epist.* 88, § 7. The law itself is probably lost. The edict which was issued after the petition of the council, is in the *Codex Theodos. de Heret.* l. 38. *Schl.*]

³ [These *Edicts of Uniformity* are mentioned in the *Codex Theodos.* l. 2, *de religione*; and in the Decree of the Council of Carthage, A. D. 407, in *Cod. Eccles. African.* can. 99, and by Du Pin, p. 220. Godefroi and Tillemont suppose the before-mentioned law (l. 38, *de Heret.*) and l. 3, *ne Bapt. iterand.* were included among them. *Schl.*]

⁴ [The documents are found in Du Pin, and the laws in the *Codex Theodos.* l. 41 and 43, *de Heret.* *Schl.*]

⁵ [See Augustine, *Ep.* 97, § 2, &c. ep. 100, § 2, ep. 105, § 6. *Schl.*]

⁶ [This law is in the *Codex Theodos.* l. 50, *de Heret.* and in Du Pin, *Monument.* p. 224. *Schl.*]

⁷ [See Noris, *Historia Donatistarum* p. 533. *Schl.*]

ment of *Marcellinus*, a tribune, and a notary,¹ to visit Africa, in the year 411, with full power to bring this long and pernicious controversy to a conclusion. Accordingly, *Marcellinus*, about the feast of Easter, A.D. 411, in that solemn trial which is called a *conference*,² formally examined the cause, and after a three days' hearing of the parties, gave sentence in favour of the *Catholics*.³ At this court 286 Catholic bishops, and 279 Donatist bishops, were present. The vanquished Donatists then appealed to the emperor; but in vain. The principal actor in all these scenes was that most celebrated *Augustine*, who almost completely governed, by his writings, counsels, and admonitions, not only the church in Africa, but likewise the leading men there.⁴

§ 3. By the conference at Carthage, the Donatist party lost a large part of its strength; nor could it ever recover from the shock, although favoured by changes of affairs. Very many, through fear of punishment, submitted to the will of the emperor, and returned to the church. On the contumacious, the severest penalties were inflicted, such as fines, banishment, confiscation of goods, and even death upon the more obstinate and seditious.⁵ Some escaped these penalties by flight, others by concealment, and some by a voluntary death; for the Donatists were very prone to self-destruction. The *Circumcelliones*, wandering over Africa, and raging everywhere, escaped by dint of arms and violence. Their former liberties and repose were restored to the Donatists by the Vandals, who, under *Genseric*, invaded Africa in the year 427, and wrested this province from the Romans. But the edicts of the emperors had inflicted such a wound upon this sect, that, though renovated and augmented under the Vandals, it never could regain its former numbers.⁶

§ 4. The Arians, oppressed and persecuted by the imperial edicts,

¹ [Or imperial secretary. *Tr.*]

² [Collatio. *S.*]

³ See Fran. Baldwin (who was a lawyer), *Historia Collationis Carthag.* subjoined to *Optatus Milevitanus*, ed. Du Pin, p. 337. This meeting, called by Marcellinus, is improperly denominated a *conference*, or a free discussion; for the Donatists and Catholics did not enter into a disputation, in which each party endeavoured to vanquish the other by arguments. It was truly and properly a *legal trial*, in which Marcellinus, as the judge of this ecclesiastical cause appointed by the emperor, after a three days' hearing of the parties, pronounced sentence authoritatively. It appears, therefore, that no one, then, once thought of any *supreme judge* in the church, appointed by Christ. These bishops of Africa made application solely to the emperor in this contest. [Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* iv. 198, &c. *Gesta Collationis Carthaginæ habitæ*, in Du Pin's *Monument. Vet. ad Hist. Donatist.* p. 225, &c., and in Harduin's *Concil.* i. 1043, &c.; also Augustine, *Brevicul. Colla-*

tionis cum Donatistis, in his *Opp.* ix. 371, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ [His writings against the Donatists fill the whole *ninth* volume of his works, according to the Amsterdam impression of the Benedictine edition. *Schl.*]

⁵ [By virtue of the law (*Codex Theodos. de Hæreticis*, l. 52), all Donatists, without distinction, and their married women, if they would not unite with the orthodox, were to be fined, according to the wealth of each individual. Such as would not be reclaimed by this means, were to forfeit all their goods; and such as protected them were liable to the same penalties. Servants and country tenants were to undergo corporal punishments by their masters and lords, or on the other hand suffer the same pecuniary mulets. The bishops and all the clergy were to be banished to different places, yet always beyond the province; and all Donatist churches were transferred to the opposite party. *Schl.*]

⁶ [See Witsius, *Histor. Donatist.* c. viii. § 9. *Schl.*]

took refuge among those barbarous nations who gradually overturned the Roman empire in the West, and found among the Goths, Heruli, Suevi, Vandals, and Burgundians, a fixed residence and a quiet retreat. Being now safe, they treated the Catholics with the same violence that the Catholics had employed against them and other heretics, and had no hesitation about persecuting the adherents to the Nicene doctrines in a variety of ways. The Vandals who had established their kingdom in Africa, surpassed all the rest in cruelty and injustice. At first *Genseric* their king, and then *Huneric* his son, demolished the temples of such Christians as maintained the divinity of the Saviour, sent their bishops into exile, mutilated many of the more firm and decided, and tortured them in various ways.¹ And they expressly stated, that they were authorised to do so by the example of the emperors, who had enacted similar laws against the Donatists in Africa, the Arians, and others who dissented from them in religion.² During this African persecution, God himself is said to have confuted the Arians by a great miracle, causing by his almighty power the persons, whose tongues had been cut out by order of the tyrants, to speak distinctly notwithstanding, and to proclaim the praises and majesty of *Christ*. The fact itself no one can well deny, for it rests on powerful testimony: but whether there was anything supernatural in it, may be questioned.³

¹ See Victor Vitensis, *de Persecutione Vandalica* libri iii.; published by Theo. Ruinart, in connexion with his own *Historia Persecutionis Vandal.* Paris, 1694, 8vo, [and Venice, 1732.]

² See the edict of king Huneric, in Victor Vitensis, lib. iv. c. ii. p. 64, where much is said on this subject.

³ See Ruinart, *Historia Persecut. Vandal.* pt. ii. c. 7, p. 482, &c. and the recent and acute discussions of some Englishmen, respecting this miracle. *Bibliothèque Britannique*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 339, &c. t. v. pt. i. p. 171, &c. [Maclaine has here a long note in review of the discussions respecting this alleged miracle by Abbadie, Berriman, Chapman, and Dodwell, who defend the miracle; and by an anonymous writer, and Middleton, and Toll, who controvert it. The discussion turned on four points, 1. the credibility of the testimony; 2. the degree in which the men were mutilated; 3. the possibility of speaking with imperfect, and even with no tongues; and 4. the probability that God would work a miracle to decide such a theological dispute.—Schlegel's note is more historical, and, though long, may be worth insertion. Huneric (he says) in the beginning of his reign, 477, was very indulgent to the orthodox, and, at the request of the emperor Zeno, allowed them to choose a bishop of Carthage, on condition that the Arian churches in the Roman empire should be allowed the same privilege. The orthodox

did actually choose Eugenius for their bishop, 481. (Victor Vitens. *de Persecut. Vandal.* l. ii. c. 7.) But by the instigation of the Arian bishops, Huneric afterwards changed his course. He forbade any person, in a Vandal dress, attending the orthodox worship; and dismissed such of them as were in his service, and condemned them to labour in the fields. In 483, he banished to the deserts a great number of their teachers, with their adherents, on pretence of a violation of the royal statutes. In February 484, a formal conference of both parties was appointed, when the orthodox handed in a long confession of their faith, but without gaining a hearing from the Vandal patriarch, Cyrila. After this, Huneric forbade by a severe law all public worship among the orthodox; ordered their books to be burned; caused the 466 bishops, who had been called to Carthage, to be arrested and banished to different countries; and endeavoured to compel all his subjects to become Arians. Many confessors then endured the most distressing sufferings, and a great number of them were cruelly put to death. At Typasus, in Mauritania, most of the inhabitants fled to Spain, because Cyrila determined to force upon them an Arian bishop. Such as stayed behind refused to accept the bishop, and kept up their own separate worship. Huneric therefore caused their tongues to be cut out by the roots, and their right hands to be chopped off. They were able, notwithstand-

§ 5. A new sect which occasioned lamentable evils to the church, was formed by *Nestorius*, a Syrian by birth, bishop of Constantinople, a pupil of the celebrated *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, a man of eloquence, and not without learning, but arrogant and indiscreet. That *Christ* was truly God, and at the same time truly man, had been placed beyond all controversy by the decrees of former councils; but as to the *mode* and the *effects* of the union of these two natures in *Christ*, hitherto there had been no discussion among Christians, and nothing had been decided by the councils. The Christian doctors were therefore accustomed to express themselves differently respecting this mystery. Some used expressions which seemed to separate between the Son of God and the Son of man too far, and to make out *two persons* in *Christ*. Others seemed to confound the Son of God with the Son of man, and to make both natures in *Christ* coalesce, and constitute but *one nature*. The Syrian and oriental doctors differed, in this matter, from those of Alexandria and Egypt, after the rise of the sect of *Apollinaris*; for he taught that the man *Christ* was without a proper human soul, and that the divine nature in *Christ* supplied the place of a rational soul; whence arose a confusion of natures. The Syrians, therefore, to distinguish themselves from the followers of *Apollinaris*, carefully distinguished the *man* from the *God* in *Christ*, and used phraseology which might lead to the supposition, that they divided the person of *Christ* into *two persons*. On the contrary, the Alexandrians and the Egyptians were accustomed to adopt modes of expression which might be charged with favouring Apollinarianism, and which seemed to imply a confusion of the two natures. *Nestorius* being bred in the Syrian schools, and extremely anxious for the extermination of all the sects,

ing, to speak distinctly. Victor expresses himself with so much assurance on this subject, that he says, whoever doubts the fact, need only go to Constantinople, where he will now meet with a sub-deacon, named Reparatus, who, although his tongue was cut out, nevertheless speaks without any effort, clearly and distinctly, and is on that account in high esteem in the court of the emperor Zeno, and especially with the empress. Aeneas of Gaza, a Platonic philosopher, who then lived at Constantinople, and was an eye-witness (in his Dialogue on the Resurrection, entitled *Theophrastus*, p. 81), says he had himself seen these people, and had heard them, to his amazement, speak distinctly; that he would not trust his ears, but ascertained the fact by ocular proof; that he made them open their mouths, and then found that their tongues were cut out at the roots. Procopius testifies that many of those whose tongues had been cut out, were living at Constantinople in his time, and that they spoke very distinctly. The count Marcellinus, who was chancellor to Justinian, and compiled his Chronicle from

the records of the judicial courts, says: *se vidisse mutum quendam, ita natum, post abscissam linguam statim locutum, refutasse Arianorum hæresin et de fide Christiana veras voces emisisse*. Isidorus, in his Chronicle, testifies also to the fact; as does Evagrius, in his *H. E.* iv. 14. See Valesius on these passages; and Sagittarius, *de Cruciat. Martyr.* p. 296, and Joh. And. Schmidt, *Diss. de Elinquatis Mysterium Trinitatis prædicantibus*, in his *Decas Dissert. Hist. Theol.* No. 7. Even Justinian himself (*Codex Justin.* lib. i. tit. 27, *de Officio Præfecti Prætorio Africæ*) says: ‘We have seen venerable men, with their tongues cut out from the roots, lamentably describing their sufferings.’ One must therefore carry historical scepticism quite too far, if he would question the reality of the fact. But whether it be not possible, that a man should speak distinctly without a tongue, and also whether that, which took place in Africa during the persecution, was a real miracle or not, are more properly physical than historical questions. *Tr.*]

and especially that of the Apollinarists, discoursed of the two natures in *Christ*, after the manner of his instructors, and directed his hearers to make a distinction between the Son of God and the Son of man, and carefully to discriminate the actions and sensations of the one from those of the other.¹

§ 6. The occasion for this controversy was given by *Anastasius*, a presbyter and the intimate friend of *Nestorius*. This presbyter, in a public discourse delivered A.D. 428, opposed the use of the word *Θεοτόκος*, or *mother of God*, which was now more frequently applied to the mother of *Christ*, in discussions with the Arians, than formerly, and to which the Apollinarists were exceedingly attached; alleging that the holy virgin could only be called *χριστοτόκος*, *mother of Christ*; because *God* could neither be born nor die, and that only the *Son of man* was born of *Mary*. *Nestorius* approved this discourse of his friend, and in several addresses explained and defended it.² Some monks at Constantinople made opposition, maintaining that the son of *Mary* was *God incarnate*; and they endeavoured to stir up the people against *Nestorius*. But most persons were pleased with his discourses; and when they were carried to the monks of Egypt, these were so moved by his arguments, that they embraced his opinions, and ceased to denominate *Mary* the *mother of God*.³

§ 7. *Cyril*, a man of a most restless and arrogant spirit, was then bishop of Alexandria, and of course jealous of the increasing power and authority of the Constantinopolitan prelate. On hearing of this controversy, he at once blamed both his monks and *Nestorius*. But as the latter would not retract, *Cyril*, after advising with *Cælestine*, the bishop of Rome, resolved on war; and calling a council at Alexandria, A.D. 430, he hurled twelve *anathemas* at the head of *Nestorius*, who,

¹ A *History of Nestorianism* was written in French by the Jesuit, Ludov. Doucin, Paris, 1716, 4to. But it is such a one as might be expected from a person who was obliged to rank Cyril among the saints, and Nestorius among the heretics. [A better account is given by Walch, in his *Hist. Ketz.* v. 289, &c. to the end of the volume.] The ancient writers, on both sides, are mentioned by J. F. Buddeus, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, ii. 1084, &c. In what manner the oriental writers relate the matter, is stated by Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 108, and by Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Bibliotheca Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. iii. pt. ii. p. lxxvii. &c. [For the sources of knowledge, and a list of the writers on this controversy, see Walch, loc. cit. p. 304, &c.—For testimony to the persecuting spirit of Nestorius, see Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 29, where we are told, that on the very day of his installation, he thus publicly addressed the emperor: 'Give me a country purged of heretics, and I will recompense you with heaven; aid me to conquer the heretics, and I will aid you to conquer the Persians.' And five days

after, he commenced his work, by demolishing the Arian house of worship, and proceeding to persecute the Novatians, the Quartodecimani, and the Macedonians. He was undoubtedly a rash zealot, yet a person of some talents, sincere, and by no means inclined to be an heresiarch. See a general account of him, in cent. v. pt. ii. c. 2, § 11, note. *Tr.*]

² See these discourses of Nestorius, in the works of Marius Mercator, ii. 5, &c. accompanied with the observations of Joh. Garnier. [See also Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 32. *Tr.*]

³ [Cyril, against Nestorius, lib. i. and in his Epistle to the monks, to Nestorius, and to Cælestine. *Schl.*—The incessant use of this party-term in the church of Rome has produced very serious evils, ignorant and superstitious minds being confirmed by it in a propensity to deify the Virgin Mary. Thus, not only have Christian principles been undermined, but also a tinsel glare has lowered the majesty of public worship. *S.*]

finding himself accused of blasphemy against *Christ*, returned as many *anathemas* against *Cyril*, accusing him of the same crime, and of Apollinarianism, and of confounding the two natures of *Christ*.¹ This contest between two bishops of the highest order, which originated rather from the depraved passions of the mind than from a sincere love of truth, was the parent and the cause of immense evils.

§ 8. The feelings of the parties being so exasperated by their reciprocal excommunications and letters, that there was no prospect of an amicable termination to the controversy, the emperor, *Theodosius II.*, assembled a council at Ephesus, in the year 431, which is accounted the *third general council*. *Cyril*, the adversary of *Nestorius*, presided; and he wished to have the cause examined and decided, before *John*, the bishop of Antioch, and the other bishops of the East, should arrive. *Nestorius* maintained, that both circumstances were contrary to equity; and, therefore, when summoned to trial, he refused to appear. But *Cyril*, pressing the business forward, without a hearing of the cause, and a great part of the bishops being absent, *Nestorius*, whom the council compare with *Judas* the betrayer of the Saviour, was condemned as guilty of blasphemy, deprived of his office, and sent into banishment, in which he closed his days.²

¹ See Joh. Harduin, *Concilia*, i. 2199. Other *anathemas*, different from the published ones, are set forth by Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 199, &c. [See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* v. 700, &c. *Tr.*—There was much in the conduct of *Cyril* that seems unjustifiable, but up to the time of the council he gave no grounds for severe blame. The following is a succinct statement of the circumstances that led to the council. *Nestorius* was consecrated, 428, April 10. *Anastasius* preached against the term *Theotokos*, shortly before Christmas, and was supported by *Nestorius* in his Christmas sermons. These sermons were immediately attacked by two laymen, *Eusebius*, afterwards bishop of Dorylæum, and *Marius Mercator*, and answered by *Proclus*, bishop of Cyzicus, in March 429. *Dorotheus*, bishop of Marciopolis, went so far as to anathematize the formula and its supporters. Copies of *Nestorius*'s sermons were circulated in Egypt, where *Cyril*, who, in his paschal epistle read at the Epiphany, had taken the opposite view of the question, found that they were making converts among his monks. He therefore wrote a letter to the monks in refutation of *Nestorius*, and had it circulated at Constantinople. *Nestorius* commissioned one *Photius* to answer it, and began to form a court party against *Cyril*. *Cyril* wrote to him to remonstrate, and had a short and evasive answer. He also wrote to the imperial princesses. *Nestorius* then applied to pope *Celestine* for support, and sent his sermons, which were

intrusted by the pope to Leo his archdeacon, and by him to John Cassian to translate and answer. *Cyril* also wrote to the pope, mentioning *Nestorius* by name, and explaining his heresy. Early in 430, *Cyril* wrote again argumentatively to *Nestorius*, and had a like answer. *Nestorius* also wrote a second letter to *Celestine*, who, in August, after holding a council on the subject, wrote a warning letter to *Nestorius*, and requested *Cyril*, in his name and his own, to admonish *Nestorius*, and desire him to renounce his heresy within ten days. He wrote, at the same time, to John the patriarch of Antioch, who prevailed on *Nestorius* to modify his expressions, and explain that it was only the erroneous interpretation of the term that he rejected. *Cyril* now prepared twelve *anathemas* for *Nestorius* to sign, which he sent to Constantinople with the admonition, and other letters to the clergy and people, exhorting them to stand by the truth. In the meantime, the emperor had summoned the council of Ephesus. Through the winter the two patriarchs tried to strengthen their positions, and *Nestorius* got the assistance of *Theodoret*; he also prepared twelve counter-*anathemas*. See the *Concilia*, iii. 1—443. Neale, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* i. 233—255. Robertson, i. 401, 402. Bright, 310—330. Gieseler, i. 393—399. *Ed.*]

² Concerning this council, the principal work to be consulted is the *Variorum Patrum Epistolæ ad Concilium Ephesinum pertinentes*, which Chr. Lupus published from some MSS. at Cassino and in the Vatican, Louvain, 1682,

That base artifices and intrigues had not a little weight in this council, and that *Cyril* was influenced more by his passions than by justice and piety, no wise and good man will readily deny; but the doctrine which was established in it, that *Christ* consists of *one divine person*,

4to. Nestorius was transported to Petra in Arabia, then to Oasis, a desert place in Egypt, where he probably died in the year 435, [or rather, after A.D. 439.] The accounts of his lamentable death, given by Evagrius, *H. E.* i. 7, and by Theodorus Lector, *H. E.* ii. 565, are undoubtedly fables deserving no credit.—[On the council of Ephesus, see Walch, *Hist. Kirchenversaml.* p. 275, &c.; and *Hist. Ketz.* v. 452, &c.; from which the following account is taken.—The emperor called the council; Nestorius was one of the first that arrived. With him came two imperial ministers of state, one of whom was accompanied by soldiers, to protect the council, and was commanded by the emperor to remain with the council. Cyril of Alexandria appeared also, attended by a number of Egyptian bishops, who, with Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, were of his party. From the western provinces appeared only three deputies from the see of Rome, and one deacon deputed by the bishop of Carthage. Cyril presided, though a party. Nestorius, with the imperial commissioners, made the reasonable request that the opening of the council might be deferred till the arrival of John of Antioch, and the other eastern bishops, and also of the Italian and Sicilian members. But neither prayers, nor tears, nor commands in the name of the emperor, could move Cyril to delay; although it was affirmed that John and the other eastern bishops were within five days' travel of Ephesus. The council was opened June 22. The imperial commissioner gave his public protest against the proceeding, and then retired. Nestorius was cited three times to appear; but he refused to stand before a court so illegally sitting, and from which he had so little reason to expect justice. He was, therefore, on the same day, pronounced a heretic by an irregular outcry. The condemnation was not founded on the Holy Scriptures, but on the writings of the fathers. The next day the decision was communicated to Nestorius; and an account of it was sent to Constantinople, with a letter recommending the immediate choice of a new bishop. Candidianus, the imperial commissioner, and Nestorius, transmitted an account of the whole procedure to the emperor; and the former endeavoured, though in vain, to arrest the irregular proceedings at Ephesus. The arrival of John and the eastern bishops, on the 27th of June, made the state of things worse. They were offended with the council for not waiting for their

arrival; and united with a part of the council who opposed the violent measures against Nestorius, and who accused Cyril of many errors. Whether the two parties had afterwards any communication with each other is uncertain. John presided over the dissenting party, who met in the house where he lodged; and who, in their precipitancy, declared Cyril and Memnon to be deposed, and to be banished. From this time there were two councils sitting at Ephesus, the one under Cyril, and the other under John, as the presidents. The latter was supported by the imperial commissioner. These proceedings threatened to kindle a flame in the church, and to disturb the public peace. The emperor, therefore, thought it necessary to bring the matter before his court, and to proceed rather upon principles of good policy than of strict justice. He confirmed the decisions of both parties against each other, in regard to Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon; and sent another of his ministers to Ephesus, to expel these three bishops from the city, and to admonish the others to unite and act together. In the meantime the bishops of Cyril's party had held no less than six sessions; in the first three of which, the arrival and formal accession of the delegates from Rome, to all the proceedings of Cyril against Nestorius, and the making out of an account of this to be sent to the emperor, were the principal transactions. The three subsequent sessions tended farther to widen the breach, as the eastern bishops were publicly excommunicated by the party of Cyril, and a new confession of faith was framed by them. The imperial minister now arrived, and put Cyril and Memnon under arrest; but he laboured in vain to unite the fiercely contending parties. Both determined to send their respective deputies to the court, which was then at Chalcedon. Historians tell us, the court people were friendly to Nestorius. If so, it will be difficult to assign the cause of the unexpected revocation by the emperor of his former decree, which deprived Cyril and Memnon of their offices, while he still condemned Nestorius to banishment. Schlegel's abridgment of Walch, corrected by the original. *Tr.*—Cyril and his friends are accused of having procured this decision by subserviency, court favour, and bribery. There is much that is discreditable to both sides, but Cyril's want of principle does not justify Nestorius's heresy, nor Nestorius's heresy Cyril's violence. *Ed.*]

yet of *two natures* most closely united, but not mixed and confounded, has been approved and acknowledged by the great body of Christians.

§ 9. To pass by the minor errors which were attributed to *Nestorius*, he is said to have divided *Christ* into two persons; and to have held, that the divine nature joined itself to the full-formed man, and only aided him, during his life. But *Nestorius* himself, as long as he lived, professed himself utterly opposed to such sentiments.¹ Nor were such sentiments ever directly stated by him, but only inferred by his adversaries, from his rejection of the epithet *Mother of God*, and from some incautious and ambiguous terms which he used. Hence, very many both among the ancients and the moderns think, that he held the same sentiments that the Ephesine fathers did, though he expressed himself in a different manner; and they cast the whole blame of this most unfortunate contest upon the restless spirit of *Cyril*, and his malignant disposition towards *Nestorius*.² Allowing

¹ See Marius Mercator, *Opp.* ii. 286, ed. Garnier; and fragments of the Epistles of Nestorius, written a little before his death, in Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* ii. 40, 41.

² Among the moderns, Luther first held such sentiments, and inveighed bitterly against Cyril; *de Conciliis*, in his *Opp.* t. vii. ed. Altenb. p. 265, 266, 273, &c. He was followed by innumerable others; as Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, tom. iii. [and iv.] artic. *Nestorius* and *Rodon*. Christ. Aug. Salig, *de Eutychnismo ante Eutychem*, p. 200. Otto Fred. Schütz, *de Vita Chytræi*, ii. § 29, p. 190, 191. Jo. Voigt, *Biblioth. Historiæ Hæresiol.* t. i. pt. iii. p. 457. Paul. Fran. Jablonsky, *Exercit. de Nestorianismo*, Berl. 1720, 8vo. *Thesaurus Epistolicus Crozianus*, i. 184, &c. iii. 175. Jordan, *Vie de M. la Croze*, p. 231, and many others. What may be alleged against Nestorius, is carefully collected by Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 210, &c. [Walch (*Hist. Ketz.* v. 778, &c.), after a careful investigation, states the sentiments of Nestorius in the following propositions: 1. The doctrine of three persons in the one divine essence, as stated in the Nicene Creed, is true and certain. 2. In particular, the second Person, the divine *Word*, is true God, eternally begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with him. 3. Yet *Christ* is not only true God, but likewise a complete man; that is, he had a body, and a rational soul, just as we have. 4. His body he derived from the Virgin Mary, and in her womb. 5. Nothing therefore is more certain, than that Christ possessed *two natures*, a divine and a human. 6. Yet there are not, on this account, *two persons*, two Sons, two Christs, two Lords; but he is *one person*, one Christ, one Son, one Lord.

7. There was therefore a union between the perfect God, the *Word*, and the perfect man; and this union may be expressed by various terms, among which *συνάφεια* [connexion] is the best, but *ἔνωσις* [union] is not to be rejected. 8. To the question, *What was united?* Nestorius answered: *God and man*, the divinity and humanity, the two *natures*, or two *substances* and *hypostases*; but not two *persons*. 9. This union did not consist in this, that the natures ceased to possess their peculiar properties; for the essential difference of the two natures remained, without the least change or commixture. 10. Yet the union was inseparable, so that the *Word* was never afterwards without the assumed man, nor the man without the *Word*. 11. The union of the two natures commenced with the existence of the human nature, when he was conceived in the womb of his mother. 12. It is therefore correctly said, the *Word* became man, and was made flesh. 13. It is also correctly said, the Son of God took upon him man. 14. It is easy to state what kind of union Nestorius did not admit; but it cannot be proved that he distinctly believed as bishop John states. 15. To explain the connexion of the two natures of Christ, as united in one person, Nestorius said: The Son of God *dwells* in the man; and the flesh is the *temple* of God. Yet he explained himself by saying, that he did not understand *such an indwelling*, as the indwelling of God in the faithful and in the prophets. 16. Nestorius called the human nature an *instrument*, by which the Son of God worked; and a *garment*, with which he was clad; and said, God *carried* and *bare* the man. 17. He also admitted a *communion* or *intercourse* of the two natures. 18. And at the same time held to the so-called *personal properties*. 19. In respect to the *communication* of attributes, Nesto-

these to judge correctly, still *Nestorius* must be pronounced guilty of two faults: first, that he was disposed, rashly, and with offence to many, to abolish the use of a harmless term, which had been long current; and secondly, that he presumed to express and explain, by unsuitable phrases and comparisons, a mystery which exceeds all human comprehension. If to these faults be added the excessive vanity and impetuosity of the man, it will be difficult to determine which was the principal cause of this great contest, *Cyril* or *Nestorius*.

§ 10. The council of Ephesus was so far from putting an end to

rius held that, in the Scriptures, names are used in reference to our Saviour, which indicate the *union of the two* natures, but not one nature as *distinct* from the other; names, with which we must connect the idea of the *entire Christ*; e.g. *Immanuel, Christ Jesus, Son, Only Begotten, Lord*. 20. *Nestorius* admitted that the Scriptures attribute to Christ both divine and human attributes and acts. And he states this rule for interpreting them: Every attribute and act which the Scriptures ascribe to Christ, must be understood indeed of the *one person*, yet not of *both* his natures; but the sublime and God-befitting must be referred to the *divine* nature, and the inferior to the *human* nature. 21. In the writings of *Nestorius*, noticeable passages occur relating to expressions which denote the *participation or communication* of attributes, and which are indicative of his real sentiments on the subject. They may be divided into two classes. To the first class belong the expressions by which the properties and changes of the *human* nature are referred to Christ in his *divine* nature, or (according to the customary phraseology of those times) to the *Word* that was God. The first expression is that of *being born*. It is undeniable, that *Nestorius* (though not likewise his friends, a few only excepted) rejected the use of the term *mother of God*; as also the expression, *Mary bore the Deity*, or, *what was born of Mary, was God*. Yet it is equally undeniable, that *Nestorius* did not reject the term *mother of God*, nor indeed the other expressions, utterly and perseveringly, except under the limitation *being so and so understood*; otherwise he acknowledged and professed the correctness and harmlessness of them. 22. The next expression is, *the sufferings, the death and burial* of Christ. *Nestorius* did not deny that it was God, or *man in union with God*, i.e. *one Christ*, that was crucified, suffered, died, and was buried. But he did deny that Christ, in so far as he was God, was the subject of these changes; because he was, in his divine nature, unchangeable, and incapable of suffering and dying. 23. The third expression is *resurrection*. On this,

his views were the same as on the preceding. As he had borrowed the word *temple* from John ii. 19, &c. he insisted, that Christ there distinguishes the temple from him who raises it up. Yet this distinction he would understand to imply, not a division of *persons*, but only a difference of *natures*. 24. To the second class belong such as relate to the doctrine of a communication of the properties of the *divine* nature to the *human*. And here *Nestorius* did not deny that the *man Christ* possessed *divine* properties; but only that he possessed them *of himself*, and not by virtue of the union. 25. He conceded, that to Christ, as to his human nature, the divine names and titles were pertinent; but with the limitation, again, *not of himself, but on account of the union*. 26. He admitted, that to the *man Christ*, divine worship belonged; but again, *not for his own sake*, but on account of the union. 27. The species of communication of attributes, which our theologians call *apotelesmatic* (attributing the *mediatorial acts* of the Redeemer, in his *official capacity*, either to the complex person, or to either of his natures indiscriminately), *Nestorius* fully recognised; and it is not true that he regarded the work of *redemption* as the work solely of the *human* nature. 28. Hence it follows, that *Nestorius* understood well, and expressed distinctly, the *unity of the person* of Christ, and also the *diversity and union of the two natures*, with its consequences; yet that he was always anxious for excluding the use of such expressions, as obscured and rendered undiscernible the *distinction* of the two natures. Hence, when he spoke of Christ, he preferred using a name expressive of his complex person. Thus he would rather say *χριστοτόκος, mother of Christ*, than say *θεοτόκος, mother of God*; or if the latter could not be avoided, he would add something to qualify it, as *mother of the God-Man*.—Dr. Walch is one who thinks the whole controversy between *Nestorius* and his accusers, was a mere dispute about words and phrases. But Dr. Hofmann, in a dispute at Wittenberg, A. D. 1725, maintained, that *the Nestorian controversy was not mere logomachy*. Schl.]

these contentions, that it rather extinguished all hope of the restoration of harmony. *John*, bishop of Antioch, and the other Eastern prelates, whose arrival *Cyril* would not wait for, assembled at Ephesus; and they issued against *Cyril* and his friend *Memnon*, bishop of Ephesus, as severe a sentence as *they* had issued against *Nestorius*. Hence arose a violent and embarrassing controversy between *Cyril* and those oriental bishops who were under the guidance of *John* of Antioch. It was, indeed, partially adjusted in the year 433, when *Cyril* acceded to a formula of faith prescribed by *John*, and rejected the use of certain suspicious phrases. Yet the commotions produced by this controversy continued long in the East.¹ Thenceforward, no means could prevent the friends and disciples of *Nestorius* from spreading his doctrines through various provinces of the East, and everywhere gathering churches which rejected the Ephesine decrees.² The Persians, in particular, were averse from any reconciliation with *Cyril*, and persevered in maintaining, that *Nestorius* was rashly condemned at Ephesus, and that *Cyril* subverted the distinction between the two natures of *Christ*. The propagation of the Nestorian doctrines was still more successful, after the introduction of those doctrines into the celebrated Persian school which had long flourished at Edessa. For the teachers in this school not only taught Nestorian principles to their pupils, but likewise translated from Greek into Syriac the writings of *Nestorius*, and his master *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, as well as of *Diodorus* of Tarsus, and spread them throughout Assyria and Persia.³

§ 11. The Nestorian faith is indebted to no one of all its friends more than to *Barsumas*, who was ejected from the school of Edessa, with his associates, and created, in the year 435, bishop of Nisibis. From the year 440 to the year 485, he laboured, with incredible assiduity and dexterity, to procure for Nestorianism a permanent establishment in Persia. *Maanes*, bishop of Ardaschir, was his principal coadjutor. His measures were so successful, that all the Nestorians in Chaldea, Persia, Assyria, and the neighbouring countries, deservedly reverence this *Barsumas* alone, to this day, as their parent and founder. He persuaded the Persian monarch, *Pherozes*, to expel the Christians who adhered to the opinions of the Greeks, and not only to admit Nestorians in their place, but also to allow them to make the first cities in Persia, Seleucia, and Ctesiphon, their primary see; which their *patriarch*, or *catholic*, occupies even down to our times. He also erected the famous school at *Nisibis*, from which issued those who, in this and the following century, carried the

¹ See Christ. Aug. Salig, *de Eutychnismo ante Eutychem*, p. 243, &c. [and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* v. 619, &c. *Schl.*]

² [The Roman provinces, in which Nestorianism most prevailed, were the two Syrias, the two Cilicias, Bithynia, Messia, Thessaly, Isauria, and the second Cappadocia. *Tr.*]

³ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* i. 351, &c. t. iii. pt. ii. p. 69. From which, with other passages, we should correct the account of the early history of Nestorianism, given by Eus. Renanot (*Liturgiarum Oriental.* ii. 99, &c.), and by others. See also Theodorus Lector, *H. E.* ii. 558.

Nestorian doctrines into Egypt, Syria, Arabia, India, Tartary, and even to China.¹

§ 12. Before this sect became fully formed and established, there was some difference of opinion in it. Some said, that the manner in which the two natures in *Christ* were combined, was wholly unknown; but others denied any other connexion than that of will, operation, and dignity.² But this disagreement completely disappeared, from the time when the Nestorian community became duly consolidated. For it was decreed by the synods assembled at Seleucia, that there were in the Saviour of mankind *two persons*, or *ὑποστάσεις*, namely, a *divine*, that of the *Word*, and a *human*, that of *Jesus*; yet that both persons constituted but one *Aspect*, or, as they (following *Nestorius*) expressed it, one *Barsopa*, that is *πρόσωπον*: that this union of the Son of God with the Son of man took place at the very moment of conception, and would never end; but that it was not a union of natures or persons, but only of will and feeling. *Christ*, therefore,

¹ All these transactions are well illustrated by the before-mentioned Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican. t. iii. pt. ii. p. lxxvii. &c.* [The Nestorians are not called by this name in the East (for they regard their doctrines as apostolic; and they never had any connexion with the person of Nestorius), but are generally called *Chaldaic Christians* (because their principal church is in the ancient Chaldea), and in some part of the East Indies, *St. Thomas' Christians*, because they suppose they received Christianity from the apostle Thomas.—[Mr. Badger, in his *Nestorians and their Liturgies*, i. 176, shows that the Nestorians have no objection to the name, and that the *Chaldeans* are properly the converts to Rome. *Ed.*] Their church extends through all Asia, and exists partly in the Persian, partly in the Turkish, and partly in the Mogul empires. The patriarch resides in a monastery not far from Mosul, and has a great many bishops under him. The enmity of the Persians, and afterwards of the Mahumedans and Saracens against the Romans, contributed much to further the spread of this sect; for they received all refugees from the Roman empire, and extended full protection to such Christians as were not tolerated in the Roman provinces, and whom of course they could not suspect of any understanding with the Romans. Ibas, bishop of Edessa, was one of the greatest defenders of Nestorius among the orientals; and, on that account, his epistle to Maris, the Persian bishop of Ardaschir, was rejected by some councils. But the chief persons among them were Barsumas, and his assistant Maanes. After the death of Barsumas, the archbishop of Seleucia, Babuæus, became the head of the party; and from this time onward, the patriarchs (*catholici*

or *jacelich*) resided at Seleucia, until, under the caliphs, Bagdat and Mosul were selected for that purpose. This Babuæus held a council in the year 499, in which not only the whole Persian church professed itself to belong to the Nestorian community, but regulations were also made, that all bishops and priests must be married, and second marriages of the clergy were not merely permitted, but declared to be necessary. (See Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. t. iii. pt. ii. p. 177.*) The Nestorians differ from other Christians in the following particulars: that they will not call Mary the *mother of God*; and wholly reject the expressions *God was crucified*, and *died*; that they admit no *natural and personal*, but only a *friendly union* of the *Word that was God* (for so they speak), with the *man Jesus*: that they teach, there are in Christ two natures and two substances, each of which has its own personality: that they reject the council of Ephesus, execrate Cyril as being a wicked wretch, and venerate Nestorius, and Theodorus of Mopsuestia, as being saints: that they worship no images; and perform their worship, which is very simple, in the Syriac language. Together with *baptism*, which they generally administer on the fortieth day after the birth, and the *Lord's supper*, in which they use leavened bread, they make the *consecration of priests* to be a *sacrament*. They also practise anointing with oil, as a ceremony of worship; and likewise in slight diseases, and even in commencing journeys, as a sort of consecration. See Baumgarten's *Geschichte der Religionspartheien*, p. 586. *Schl.*]

² Leontius Byzantinus, *adv. Nestorianos et Eutychanos*; p. 537, tom. i. *Lectiō. Antiquar. Hen. Canisii*: and Ja. Basnage, *Prolegom. ad Canisium*, t. i. c. ii. p. 19, &c.

must be carefully distinguished from God, who dwelt in *Christ* as in his temple (as *Nestorius* had said); and that *Mary* should never be called the *mother of God*, but only the *mother of Christ*. They reverence *Nestorius* as a holy man, and worthy of everlasting remembrance; but they maintain, that his doctrine was much more ancient than he, being derived from the earliest ages of the church; and therefore they wish not to be called *Nestorians*. And it appears, in fact, that *Barsumas* and his associates did not inculcate on their followers precisely the doctrines taught by *Nestorius*, but that, in some measure, they polished his imperfect system, enlarged it, and connected with it other doctrines which he never embraced.

§ 13. Many, while careful to shun the fault of *Nestorius*, ran into the opposite extreme. The most noted of these was *Eutyches*, abbot of a certain convent of monks at Constantinople; from whom originated another sect, directly opposite to that of *Nestorius*, but equally troublesome and mischievous to the interests of Christianity. Like lightning, too, it went across the East, and in going, gained so much strength, that it not only found infinite employment as well for the Nestorians as the Greeks, but also made its way to a position of great importance. In the year 448, *Eutyches*, now far advanced in years, in order more effectually to put down *Nestorius*, to whom he was a violent foe, explained the doctrine concerning the person of *Christ*, in the phraseology of the Egyptians; and maintained that there was *only one nature in Christ*, namely, *the Word's*, but that an incarnate nature.¹ Hence he was supposed to deny the *humanity* of Jesus

¹ That Cyril had so expressed himself, and had appealed to the authority of Athanasius, to justify the phraseology, is beyond controversy. But whether Athanasius actually used such language, is doubtful; for many think the book in which it occurs, was not a production of Athanasius. See Mich. Le Quien, *Diss. ii. in Damascenum*, p. xxxi. &c. and Christ. Aug. Salig, *de Eutychnismo ante Eutychen*, p. 112, &c. That the Syrians used the same phraseology before Eutyches' times, and without offence, is shown by Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* i. 219.—We are yet in want of a solid and accurate history of the Eutychnian troubles; which, however, Christ. Aug. Salig left in manuscript. [This has not yet been published: but Walch has given a very elaborate and full history of the Eutychnian and Monophysite sects, filling the whole sixth, seventh, and eighth volumes of his *Hist. Ketz.* Lips. 1773, 76—78, 8vo; and M. Schroeckh has treated the subject well, in his *Kirchengeschichte*, xviii. 433—636, Lips. 1793, 8vo.—The points in controversy between Eutyches and his friends on the one part, and their antagonists on the other, during the first period of the contest, or till the council of Chalcedon in 451, according to Walch (vi. 611—619), were in

amount as follows:—Both held alike, 1. the perfect correctness of the Nicene Creed; and of course, 2. both held the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the Godhead; 3. that God, the Word, was made flesh; 4. that Christ was truly God and truly man united; and 5. that, after the union of the two natures, he was *one person*. But Eutyches maintained, 6. that the two natures of Christ after the union did not remain *two distinct* natures, but constituted *one nature*; and therefore, 7. that it was correct to say, Christ was constituted *of* or *from* two natures; but not that he *existed* in two natures. For 8. the union of the two natures was such that, although neither of them was lost, or was essentially changed, yet together they constituted *one nature*; of which compound nature, and not of either of the original natures alone, must thenceforth be predicated each and every property of both natures. He accordingly denied, 9. that it is correct to say of Christ, that, as to his human nature, he was *ὁμοούσιος* (*of the same nature*) with us. It is to be remembered, that Eutyches was solicitous chiefly to confute Nestorius, who kept the two natures almost entirely distinct, and seemed to deny any other union than that of *purpose* and *co-operation*; and in particular he disliked all phrases which

Christ; and was accused, by *Eusebius* of Dorylæum, before a council called by *Flavianus*, perhaps in this very year, at Constantinople. And as *Eutyches* refused to give up his opinions at the bidding of this council, he was cast out of the church, and deprived of his office. He did not, however, acquiesce in this decree, but appealed to a general council of the whole church.¹

§ 14. The emperor *Theodosius*, therefore, convoked at Ephesus, in the year 449, such a council as *Eutyches* had requested; and placed at the head of it *Dioscorus*, bishop of Alexandria, a man like *Cyril*, that is, arrogant and turbulent, and hostile to the bishop of Constantinople. In this council, the business was conducted with the same kind of fairness and justness, as by *Cyril* in the council of Ephesus against *Nestorius*. For *Dioscorus*, in whose church were taught nearly the same things that *Eutyches* had advanced, so artfully managed and controlled the whole of the proceedings, that the doctrine of *one nature incarnate* was triumphant, and *Eutyches* was acquitted of all error. On the contrary, *Flavianus* was severely scourged, and banished to Epipa, a city of Lydia, where he soon after died.² The Greeks call this Ephesine council *σύνοδος ληστρικὴ, an Assembly of Robbers*, to signify that everything was carried in it by fraud and violence. This name, however, would be equally applicable to many councils of this and the subsequent times.

§ 15. But the scene changed soon after. *Flavianus* and his adherents engaged *Leo* the Great, the Roman pontiff, on their side — a course which was commonly taken in that age by those who were foiled by their enemies — and also represented to the emperor, that an affair of such magnitude demanded a general council to settle it. *Theodosius*, however, could not be persuaded to grant the request of *Leo*, and call such a council. But on his death, *Marcian*, his successor, summoned a new council at Chalcedon, in the year 451, which is called the *fourth general* council. In this very numerous

predicated the acts and sufferings of the *human* nature, of the *divine* nature: and to enable him to overturn this error, he so blended the two natures, that they could not afterwards be distinguished. *Tr.*]

¹ [This was an occasional council assembled for other purposes, before which *Eusebius* appeared and accused *Eutyches*. The council peremptorily required him to give up his opinions; and on his refusal, proceeded at once to excommunicate him. See the Acts of this council, in Harduin's *Collection*, ii. 70, &c. See also Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* vi. 108—158. *Tr.*]

² See Jo. Harduin, *Concilia*, i. 82, &c. Liberatus, *Breviarium*, c. xii. p. 76. *Leo Magn. Epist.* xciii. p. 625. *Nicephorus, Hist. Eccles.* lib. xiv. c. 47, p. 550, &c. [Walch, *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 301, &c. and *Hist. Ketz.* vi. 175—264. Bower's *Lives of the Popes* (*Leo*), ii. 42—48. The aged emperor *Theodosius II.* was managed

by the *Eutychians*; and therefore he called such a council as would accomplish their wishes. In the council, *Eutyches* offered a confession of faith which did not touch the point in debate; and this was accepted, without allowing his accusers to be heard. By acclamation the doctrine of *two natures* in the incarnate Word was condemned. *Dioscorus* then proposed to condemn *Flavianus* and *Eusebius*. Here opposition was made; and *Dioscorus* called on the imperial commissioners, who threw open the doors of the church; a band of soldiers and an armed mob rushed in. The terrified bishops no longer resisted. Every member (in all, 149) signed the decrees. *Flavianus* was deposed and banished. *Eusebius* of Dorylæum, *Theodoret* of Cyrus, *Domnus* of Antioch, and several others, were also deposed. The decisions of this council were ratified by the emperor, and ordered to be everywhere enforced. *Tr.*]

assembly, the legates of *Leo* the Great (who had already publicly condemned the doctrine of *Eutyches*, in his famous Epistle to *Flavianus*), were exceedingly active and influential. *Dioscorus*, therefore, was condemned, deposed, and banished to Paphlagonia; the Acts of the Ephesine council were rescinded; the Epistle of *Leo* was received as a rule of faith; *Eutyches*, who had already been divested of the dignity of a presbyter and exiled by the emperor, was condemned, though absent; and not to mention the other decrees of the council, all Christians were required to believe, what most to this day do believe, that in *Jesus Christ* there is but *one person*, yet *two distinct natures no way confounded or mixed*.¹

§ 16. This remedy, which was intended to heal the wounds of the church, proved worse than the disease. For a great part of the Oriental and Egyptian doctors, though holding various sentiments in other respects, agreed in a vigorous opposition to this council of Chalcedon, and to the Epistle of *Leo* the Great, which the council had adopted, and contended for *one nature in Christ*. Hence arose most deplorable discords, and civil wars almost exceeding credibility. In *Egypt*, the excited populace, after the death of the emperor Marcian,² murdered *Proterius*, the successor of *Dioscorus*, and appointed in his place *Timotheus Ælurus*, a defender of the doctrine of *one nature incarnate*. And although *Ælurus* was expelled from his office by the emperor *Leo*, yet under the succeeding emperor, *Basiliscus*, he recovered it. After his death,³ the friends of the council of Chalcedon elected *Timotheus*, surnamed *Salophaciolus*; and the advocates for one nature chose *Peter Mongus*. This latter, however, was obliged, by the emperor's mandate, to give way. But *Salophaciolus* being dead in the year 482, *Mongus*, by order of the emperor *Zeno*, and by the influence of *Acacius*, bishop of Constantinople, obtained full possession of the see of Alexandria; and *John Tulaia*, whom the Chalcedonians had elected, was removed.⁴

¹ [See the entire acts of this council, in all the Collections of Councils; e.g. Binius, and Harduin, ii. 1, &c. See also Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 2, 4. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 482—487. Walch, *Hist. Kirchenversaml.* 307—314, and *Hist. Ketz.* vi. 293—489. Bower, *Lives of the Popes* (Leo I.), ii. 56—100. The exposition of faith, in the fifth Action of this Council, was designed to guard against both Eutychian and Nestorian errors. After recognising the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds, with Leo's letter to Flavianus, &c. they say: 'Following, therefore, these holy fathers, we unitedly declare, that one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, is to be acknowledged, as being perfect in his Godhead, and perfect in his humanity; truly God and truly man, with a rational soul and body; of one essence (*δμοούσιος*) with the Father, as to his Godhead; and of one essence (*δμοούσιος*) with us, as to his manhood; in all things like us, sin excepted; begotten

(*γεννηθῆς*) of the Father, from all eternity, as to his Godhead; and of Mary, the mother of God (*θεοτόκου*), in these last days, for us and for our salvation, as to his manhood; recognised as one Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten; of two natures, unconfounded, unchanged, undivided, inseparable (*ἀσυνχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαίρετως, ἀχωρίστως*); the distinction of natures not at all done away by the union; but rather, the peculiarity (*ιδιότης*) of each nature preserved, and combining (*συντρεχούσης*) into one substance (*ὑπόστασις*); not separated or divided into two persons (*πρόσωπα*); but one Son, Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ: as the prophets before [taught] concerning him, and he, the Lord Jesus Christ, hath taught us, and the creed of the Fathers hath transmitted to us.' *Tr.*]

² [A.D. 457. *Tr.*]

³ [A.D. 476. *Tr.*]

⁴ See Liberatus, *Breviarium*, cap. 16, 17,

§ 17. In *Syria*, the abbot *Barsumas* (a different person from *Barsumas* of Nisibis, who gave stability to the Nestorian sect), having been condemned by the council of Chalcedon, went about propagating the doctrine of *Eutyches*. He also spread this doctrine among the neighbouring Armenians, about the year 460, by means of his disciple *Samuel*. Yet from the harsher form of the Eutychian doctrine, the Syrians afterwards departed under the guidance of *Zenaias*, or *Philoxenus*, the bishop of *Mabug*,¹ and of the very famous *Peter Gnapheus*, or, in Latin form, *the Fuller*.² For these men denied, what *Eutyches* is said to have taught, that the human nature of *Christ* was *absorbed* in the divine; and simply inculcated that *Christ* possessed *one nature*, and this a *twofold* or *compound* one. Still, as this doctrine was equally inconsistent with the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, the believers in it most steadfastly rejected that council.³

§ 18. *Peter*, who was surnamed the *Fuller*, because, while a monk, he pursued the trade of a fuller, got possession of the see of Antioch; and although he was often ejected and condemned on account of his opposition to the council of Chalcedon, yet, in the year 482, he obtained a full establishment in it by authority of the emperor *Zeno*, and the influence of *Acacius*, bishop of Constantinople.⁴ This man, who was formed to promote discord and controversy, occasioned new contests, and was looked upon as inclined to establish a new sect, which has been called the *Theopaschites*; because, to the very celebrated hymn, called *Trisagius*⁵ by the Greeks, *Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Eternal*, he enjoined upon the eastern churches this addition, *who wast crucified for us*. He made undoubtedly this addition with sectarian views, intending to establish men more firmly in his beloved doctrine, that of but *one nature* in *Christ*. But his adversaries, especially *Felix* of Rome and others, perverted his meaning; charging him with an intention to teach, that *all the three persons* in the Godhead were crucified: wherefore such as approved this form of the hymn were called *Theopaschites*. The consequence of this dispute was, that the western Christians rejected this form of the hymn, which they understood to refer to the whole Trinity; but the oriental Christians have used it constantly, ever since, without offence, because they refer it to *Christ* as *one person* in the Trinity.⁶

18. Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 8; iii. 3. Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 410, &c.

¹ [Or Hierapolis. Tr.]

² Fullo.

³ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* ii. 1—10, and his *Diss. de Monophysitis*, prefixed to this tome, p. ii. &c. [According to Walch, the parties were continually coming nearer together in doctrine, so that the theological dispute was sinking fast into a mere logomachy. But several questions of facts, or acts of the parties, became the subjects of lasting dispute and contention. See Walch's *Hist. Ketz.* vi. 796, &c. 825—832. Tr.]

⁴ Hen. Valesius, *Diss. de Petro Fullone et de Synodis adversus eum collectis*, annexed to his *Scriptores Histor. Eccles.* iii. 173, &c.

⁵ ['Sanctus Deus, sanctus fortis, sanctus immortalis.' (Orig.) 'The hymn *Trisagius*, "ἅγιος ὁ Θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, must not be confounded with the hymn *Tersanctus*, beginning *Holy, holy, holy*, &c. which was never used at any time, or in any office, except in the solemn thanksgiving preceding consecration.' Palmer's *Antiq. of the Engl. Ritual*, Oxf. 1832, i. 64. S.]

⁶ See Hen. Noris, *de uno ex Trinitate*

§ 19. To settle these manifold dissensions, which exceedingly disquieted both church and state, the emperor *Zeno*, in the year 482, by the advice of *Acacius*, the bishop of Constantinople, offered to the contending parties that *formula of concord* which is commonly called his *Henoticon*. This formula repeated and inculcated all that had been decreed in the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, against the Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians; but made no mention of the council of Chalcedon.¹ For *Zeno* had been led by *Acacius* to believe, that war was not waged against the *doctrine* of the council of Chalcedon, but only against the council itself. This formula of concord was subscribed by the leaders of the *Monophysite* party, *Peter Mongus*, bishop of Alexandria, and *Peter Fullo*, bishop of Antioch. It was likewise approved by *Acacius* of Constantinople, and by all the more moderate of both parties. But the violent, on either side, stoutly resisted, and complained that this *Henoticon* did injustice to the most holy council of Chalcedon.² Hence arose new controversies, as troublesome as those which preceded.

§ 20. A considerable part of the *Monophysites* or *Eutychians* considered *Peter Mongus* to have committed a great crime, by acceding to the *Henoticon*; and, therefore, they united in a new party, which was called that of the *Acephali*, because they were deprived of their head or leader.³ Afterwards this sect became divided into three

carne passo Liber, in his *Opp.* t. iii. Diss. i. c. 3, p. 782. Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* i. 518, &c. ii. 36, 180, &c [and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* vii. 237, &c. 329, 339, &c. Tr.]

¹ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 14. Liberatus, *Breviarium Histor.* c. 18. [Mosheim's description of this famous decree is very imperfect. In it the emperor explicitly recognises the *creed* of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan councils, as the only established and allowed creed of the church; and declares every person an alien from the true church, who would introduce any other. This creed, he says, was received by that council of Ephesus, which condemned Nestorius, whom, with Eutyches, the emperor pronounces to be heretics. He also acknowledges the twelve chapters of Cyril of Alexandria to be sound and orthodox; and declares Mary to be the *mother of God*, and Jesus Christ to be (*ὑποούσιος*) of *one substance* with the Father, as touching his Godhead, and *ὑμοούσιος* with us, as touching his manhood. Thus he fully recognised the doctrines of the council of Chalcedon, without mentioning that body; and affirming that these doctrines were embraced by all members of the true church, he calls upon all Christians to unite on this sole basis; and 'anathematizes every person who has thought, or thinks, otherwise, either now, or at any other time, whether at Chalcedon,

or in any other synod whatever; but more especially the aforesaid persons, Nestorius and Eutyches, and such as embrace their sentiments:' and concludes with renewed exhortations to a union on this basis. This formula of union was happily calculated to unite the more considerate of both parties. It required, indeed, some sacrifice of principle on the part of the Monophysites, or at least of their favourite phraseology; but it also required the dominant party to give up the advantage over their foes which they had obtained by the general council of Chalcedon. In Egypt, the *Henoticon* was extensively embraced; but the bishops of Rome were opposed to it, and were able to render it generally inefficient. Tr.]

² See Facundus Hermianensis, *Defensio trium Capitulorum*, l. xii. c. 4.

³ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 13. Leontius Byzant. *de Sectis*, tom. i. *Lection. Antiquar.* Hen. Canisii, p. 537. Timotheus Presbyter, in Joh. Bapt. Cotelier, *Monument. Ecclesie Græcæ*, iii. 409. [From the time of the council of Chalcedon, the Eutychians gradually receded from the peculiar views of Eutyches; and, therefore, discarded the name of Eutychians, and assumed the more appropriate one of Monophysites, which indicated their distinguishing tenet, that the two natures of Christ were so united as to constitute but *one nature*. The whole party, therefore, having long renounced Eutyches as their leader, when some of them also

parties, the *Anthropomorphites*, the *Barsanuphites*, and the *Esaians*. And these sects were succeeded in the next age by others, of which the ancients make frequent mention.¹ Yet the inquirer into the subject must be informed, that some of these Eutychian sects are altogether imaginary; that others differed not in reality, but only in terms; and that some were distinguished, not by their sentiments, but by some external rites, and other outward circumstances. And they were all likewise of temporary duration; for, in the next century, they gradually became extinct, chiefly through the influence of *Jacobus Baradaeus*.²

§ 21. The Roman pontiff, *Felix III.*, with his friends, attacked *Acacius*, the bishop of Constantinople, who had favoured the *Henoticon*, as a betrayer of the truth, and excluded him from church communion. To justify this hostility, *Felix* and his successors taxed *Acacius* with favouring the Monophysites, and their leaders, *Peter Mongus* and *Peter Fullo*, with contempt for the council of Chalcedon, and with some other things. But in reality, as many facts demonstrate, *Acacius* became odious to the Roman pontiffs, merely because he denied by his actions the supremacy of the Roman see, and was extremely eager to gain an increase of power and dignity for the bishop of New Rome. The Greeks defended the character and memory of their bishop, against the aspersions of the Romans. This contest was protracted till the following century, when the pertinacity of the Romans triumphed, and caused the names of *Acacius* and *Peter Fullo* to be stricken from the sacred registers, and consigned as it were to perpetual infamy.³

§ 22. The thing itself, which produced so great a series of evils, appears to be but slight. It is said, that *Eutyches* himself thought the divine nature of Christ to have *absorbed* his human nature; so that *Christ* consisted of but *one nature*, and that the *divine*. Yet whether this was the fact or not, is not sufficiently clear. This sentiment, however, together with *Eutyches*, was abandoned and rejected by the adversaries to the council of Chalcedon, under the guidance of *Xenias* and *Peter Fullo*; and, therefore, they are more properly called *Monophysites* than *Eutychians*. For all who are designated by this name held that the divine and human natures of *Christ* were so united as to constitute but *one nature*; yet without any conversion, confusion, or commixture: and that this doctrine might not be under-

renounced *Peter Mongus*, they were indeed *Acephali*, *without a head*. Yet all the branches of this sect continued to bear the name of Monophysites till late in the sixth century, when *Jacobus Baradaeus* raised them up from extreme depression through persecution, and they assumed the name of Jacobites—a name which they bear to this day. *Tr.*]

¹ These sects are enumerated by *Ja. Basnage*, *Prolegom. ad Hen. Canisii Lectiones Antiquas*, cap. iii.; and *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Diss. de Monophysitis*, p. 7, &c.

² [See cent. vi. pt. ii. c. 5. *Ed.*]

³ *Hen. Valesius*, *Diss. de Synodis Romanis, in quibus damnatus est Acacius*, subjoined to the third volume of his *Scriptores Histor. Eccles.* p. 179, &c. *J. Basnage*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, i. 301, 380, 381, &c. *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit.* t. i. art. *Acacius*, p. 75, &c. *Dav. Blondel*, *de la Primauté dans l'Eglise*, p. 279, &c. *Acta Sanctorum*, Februarii, iii. p. 502, &c. [*Bower's Lives of the Popes* (*Felix III.*), ii. 198. *Tr.*]

stood differently from their real meaning, they often said, there is but *one nature* in *Christ*, yet it is *twofold* and *compound*.¹ With *Eutyches* they disclaimed all connexion; but they venerate *Dioscorus*, *Barsumas*, *Xenius*, and *Peter Fullo*, as pillars of their sect; and reject the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, together with the epistle of *Leo* the Great. This view of things, if it be estimated by the language used, appears to have differed from the doctrines established at Chalcedon, in the mode of stating them, but not in reality.² Yet, if we attend carefully to the metaphysical arguments and subtleties by which it is supported,³ perhaps we shall conclude, that the Monophysite controversy with the Chalcedonians was not wholly about words.

§ 23. Other troubles invaded the church in this century from the West, and continued down through subsequent ages. *Pelagius*⁴ and *Cœlestius*,⁵ the former a Briton, and the latter an Irishman, both

¹ See the quotations from works of the Monophysites, by that excellent, and at times sufficiently ingenuous writer, Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* ii. 25, 26, 29, 34, 117, 133, 135, 277, 297, &c.

² Many learned men consider this controversy as a mere strife about words. Among the Monophysites, Gregory Abulpharajus, the most learned of the sect, was of this opinion. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* ii. 291. Add the *Biblioth. Italique*, xvii. 285. Matur. Veis. la Croze, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*, p. 23; and *Hist. du Christ. d'Ethiopie*, p. 14, &c. Even Asseman (*loc. cit.* p. 297), though living at Rome, came near to avowing this opinion.

³ See the subtle disputation of Abulpharajus, in Asseman, ii. 288.

⁴ [Pelagius, the heresiarch, was probably a Welshman, whose real name, it is said, was Morgan, or *Marigena*, which was translated Πελάγιος, *Pelagius*. He was a monk, went to Rome about 400, imbibed the opinions of Origen, and began to publish his heretical sentiments concerning original sin and free grace about 405. In 408, when the Goths were laying waste Italy, he and Cœlestius retired to Sicily, and, in 411, to Africa. Cœlestius remained there, but Pelagius proceeded on to Egypt, to visit the monks of that country. In 415, he removed to Palestine, where he enjoyed the protection of John, bishop of Jerusalem. Orosius (now in the East) impeached him; but he so far purged himself, before the council of Diospolis in 417, as to be acquitted. But the next year he was condemned by the councils of Carthage and Milevis, as well as by the popes, Innocent and Zosimus; and the emperor Honorius ordered him and his adherents to be expelled from Rome. Theodotus of Antioch

now held a council, which condemned him. His subsequent history is unknown. He was a man of distinguished genius, learning, and sanctity. Yet he was accused of dissembling as to his real sentiments. He wrote fourteen books of *Commentaries* on Paul's Epistles (perhaps the very books published among the works of Jerome, and ascribed to that father); also an Epistle to Demetrius, *de Virginitate*, A.D. 413 (falsely ascribed both to Jerome and to Augustine, and published as theirs); a *Confession of his Faith*, addressed to Innocent, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 417. His lost works are, *de Fide Trinitatis*, lib. iii.—*Libro εὐλογῶν sive Testimoniorum* (collections from Scripture, in support of some doctrines)—*de Libero Arbitrio*, lib. iv.—*de Natura Libero*; and several Epistles.—See Cave's *Historia Litteraria*, i. 381, &c. Tr.]

⁵ [Cœlestius, of honourable birth, was a student at Rome when Pelagius arrived there. Embracing his views, he accompanied him to Sicily in 408, and to Africa in 411, where he remained some years. In 412, he was accused before the bishop of Carthage of heresy, and condemned by a council there. He appealed to the bishop of Rome, but went to Ephesus, where he became a presbyter. He now disseminated his errors widely in Asia and the islands. In 416 he went to Constantinople, and the next year to Rome, when he so far satisfied Zosimus, as to obtain from him a recommendation to the bishops of Africa to restore him. But in 418 he was condemned by a synod at Rome, and was banished from the empire by the emperor. He now concealed himself in the East. In 429, the emperor forbade his coming to Constantinople. In 430, a synod at Rome condemned him; and also the council of Ephesus in 431. From that time we hear no more of him. He wrote a confession of his faith,

monks living at Rome, and in high reputation for their virtues and piety, considering the doctrines of Christians concerning man's innate vitiosity, and his need of divine grace within for the mind's illumination and amendment, as great impediments to the progress of holiness, and nurses of human carelessness, thought that they should be rooted out; they therefore taught that current opinions respecting a corruption of the human nature, derived to us from our first parents, were untrue; that the parents of the human race sinned only for themselves, and not for their posterity; that men are now born as pure and innocent as *Adam* was when God created him; that human beings therefore can, by their natural power, renovate themselves, and reach the highest degree of holiness; that man requires, indeed, external grace to call forth his efforts, but needs not heavenly grace within.¹ These doctrines, and such as are connected with them, the

several epistles, and some short pieces: but none of his works have reached us entire, except his confession of faith, and perhaps some epistles among those of Jerome. See Cave, *Historia Litteraria*, i. 384, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ According to Walch (*Hist. Ketz.* iv. 735, &c.), as abridged by Schlegel, the system of Pelagius was as follows. 1. Men, as they now come into the world, are, in respect to their powers and abilities, in the same state as that in which *Adam* was created. 2. *Adam* sinned; but his sinning harmed no one but himself. 3. Human nature, therefore, is not changed by the fall: and death is not a punishment for sin; but *Adam* would have died had he not apostatized. For death is inseparable from our nature; and the same is true of the pains of childbirth, diseases, and outward evils, particularly in children. 4. Much less is the guilt of *Adam's* sin imputed to his offspring; for God would be unjust if he imputed to us the actions of others. 5. Such imputations cannot be proved, by the fact, that Christ has redeemed infants; for this redemption is to be understood of their heirship to the kingdom of heaven, from which, an heirship to another's guilt will not follow. 6. Neither does the baptism of infants prove such an imputation; for they thereby obtain the kingdom of heaven, which Christ has promised only to baptized persons. 7. When children die without baptism, they are not therefore damned. They are indeed excluded from the kingdom of heaven, but not from eternal blessedness. For the Pelagians held to a threefold state after death: *damnation*, for sinners; the *kingdom of heaven*, for baptized Christians who live a holy life, and for baptized children; and *eternal life*, for unbaptized children, and for unbaptized adults who live virtuous lives. 8. Much less is human nature *depraved*, in consequence of the fall

of *Adam*. There is therefore no hereditary sin. 9. For though it may be granted that *Adam* is so far the author of sin, as he was the *first* that sinned, and by his example has seduced others, yet this is not to be understood of a *propagation* of sin by generation.

10. This supposed propagation of sin is the less admissible, because it would imply a *propagation of souls*, which is not true.

11. Neither can such a propagation be maintained without impeaching the justice of God, introducing unconditional necessity, and destroying our freedom. 12. It is true there are in men sinful propensities; in particular, the propensity for sexual intercourse; but these are not sins. 13. If sin were propagated by natural generation, and every motion of the sinful propensities, and every desire, therefore, were sinful, then the marriage state would be sinful. 14. As man has ability to sin, so has he also not only ability to discern what is good, but likewise power to desire it and to perform it. And this is the freedom of the will, which is so essential to man, that he cannot lose it. 15. The *grace*, which the Scriptures represent as the source of morally good actions in man, Pelagius understood to denote various things. For he understood the word (a) of the whole constitution of our nature, and especially of the endowment of *free will*: (b) of the promulgation of the divine law: (c) of the forgiveness of past sins, without any influence on the future conduct: (d) of the example of Christ's holy life, which he called the *grace of Christ*: (e) of the internal change in the understanding, whereby the truth is recognised; which he called *grace*, and also the *assistance* of the Holy Spirit: (f) and sometimes *grace* with him was equivalent to *baptism* and *blessedness*. 16. Man is as capable of securing salvation, by the proper use of his powers, as of drawing on himself damnation by the misuse of them. 17. And therefore

above-mentioned monks secretly disseminated at Rome. But in the year 410, on account of the invasion of the Goths, they retired from Rome, and going first to Sicily, and thence to Africa, they more openly advanced their opinions. From Africa, *Pelagius* went into Palestine; but *Cælestius* continuing at Carthage, solicited a place among the presbyters of that city. His novel opinions, however, being detected, he was condemned in a council at Carthage, A.D. 412, and leaving the country, he went to Asia. From this time *Augustine*, the famous bishop of Hippo, began to assail with his pen the doctrines of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*; and to him chiefly is due the honour of suppressing this sect at its very birth.¹

God has given men a law; and this law prescribes nothing impossible. 18. God requires from men a perfect, personal obedience to his law. 19. Actions originating from ignorance or forgetfulness are not sinful. 20. So also natural propensity, or the craving of things sinful, is not of itself sinful. 21. Therefore perfect personal obedience to the law, on the part of men, is practicable, through the uncorruptness of the powers of nature. 22. And by grace (consisting in external divine aids, the right use of which depends on men's free will), good works are performed. They did not deny all internal change in men by grace, but they confined it solely to the *understanding*, and controverted all internal change of the *will*. They also limited the necessity of this grace, by maintaining that it was not indispensable to all men, and that it only *facilitated* the keeping of God's commandments. 23. This possibility of performing good works by the free use of our natural powers they endeavoured to prove, by the existence of virtuous persons among the pagans: and likewise, 24. from the saints mentioned in the Old Testament; whom they divided into two classes, the first, from Adam to Moses, who, like the pagans, had only natural grace; the second, from Moses to Christ, who had the grace of the law. Some of the saints who had the law were all their lifetime without sin; others sinned indeed, but being converted they ceased to sin, and yielded a perfect obedience to the law. 25. The grace, whereby perfect obedience becomes possible, is a consequence of precedent good works: 26. and such obedience is absolutely necessary to salvation. 27. Sins, originating from a misuse of human freedom, and continued by imitation and by custom, were forgiven, under the Old Testament, solely on account of good works; and under the New Testament, through the grace of Christ. 28. Their idea of the way of salvation, then, was this. A man who has sinned converts himself; that is, he leaves off sinning, and this by his own

powers. He believes on Christ; that is, he embraces his doctrines. He is now baptized; and on account of this baptism, all his previous sins are forgiven him, and he is without sin. He has the instructions and the example of Christ, whereby he is placed in a condition to render perfect obedience to the divine law. This he *can* do if he will; and he can either withstand all temptations, or fall from grace. 29. Moreover they admitted conditional decrees; the condition of which was either foreseen good works, or foreseen sin. *Tr.*

¹ The history of the Pelagians has been written by many persons: as by Ja. Ussher, in his *Antiquitat. Ecclesiæ Britan.*; Joh. a Laet, a Netherlander; Ger. Joh. Vossius; Hen. Noris; Jo. Garnier, in his *Supplement* to the works of Theodoret; Cornel. Jansen, in his *Augustinus*; and others. The French Jesuit, Jac. de Longueval, left a MS. *Historia Pelagiana*. See his preface to the ninth vol. of his *History of the Gallican Church*, p. iv. But among so many writers, no one yet has exhausted the whole subject, or shown himself free from undue partiality. [This partiality is to be attributed to the renewal of these controversies. In all ages there have been some in the Christian church who coincided, either wholly or partially, with Pelagius, and who opposed the doctrine of Augustine. On the other hand, the scholastics adopted the greatest part of Augustine's sentiments. And these two parties have never been at rest. The affair with Goteschalcus, and the contests between the Thomists and the Scotists, kept up these disquietudes; and in the times of the reformation, such commotions were increased, when Luther and Erasmus came upon the arena, and the council of Trent made a considerable part of the Pelagian system to be articles of faith. From that period onward, the Protestants have maintained, that the Romish church holds, not what Augustine taught, but what Pelagius, or at least the Semi-Pelagians, inculcated; and the Romish doctors endeavour to maintain the contrary. The Dominicans and the

§ 24. *Pelagius* was more fortunate in the East; for under the patronage of *John*, bishop of Jerusalem, who considered the doctrines of *Pelagius* as according with the opinions of *Origen*, to which *John* was attached, *Pelagius* freely professed his sentiments, and gathered disciples. And although he was impeached in the year 415, by *Orosius*, a Spanish presbyter, whom *Augustine* had sent into Palestine, yet a convention of bishops at Jerusalem dismissed him without censure; and a little after, in a council held at Diospolis in Palestine, he was acquitted of every crime and error.¹ The controversy being removed to Rome, *Zosimus* (who was made pontiff in the year 417), being taken in, partly by the ambiguous and apparently sound confession of faith, which *Cælestius* then residing at Rome offered, and partly by the flattering and insidious letters and protestations of *Pelagius*, pronounced sentence in favour of these monks, and decided, that wrong had been done by their adversaries to men who thought correctly.² But the Africans, led on by *Augustine*, continued perseveringly to assail them with councils, books, and letters. *Zosimus*, therefore, being better informed, changed his opinion, and severely condemned those whom he had before extolled. Afterwards, that *Ephesine* council, which hurled its thunders against *Nestorius*, also condemned them; and now the Gauls, the Britons, and the Palestinians, by their councils, and the emperors by their laws and penalties, crushed the sect in its commencement.³

Jesuits, and also the Jesuits and Jansenists, have likewise moved controversies within their own church, respecting Pelagianism and the opinions of *Augustine*: and among the Protestants, the charge of Pelagianism has been brought against the Arminians, and likewise against various individual doctors. No wonder, therefore, if all these learned writers of the Pelagian history are often betrayed into errors by the prejudices of their party. *Schl.*—Walch's account is full and candid, *Hist. Ketz.* iv. 519—846, and for the Semi-Pelagians, v. 3—228. *Münscher's* statement of the opinions of the different parties is lucid and well vouched; *Dogmengeschichte*, iv. 122—262. *Tr.*]

¹ See *Gabr. Daniel, Histoire du Concile de Diospolis*, among the shorter works of this eloquent and learned Jesuit, published, Paris, 1724, 3 vols. 4to, in t. i. p. 635—671. [Our whole information respecting these councils is derived from the opposers of *Pelagius*, *Orosius*, *Augustine*, &c. The first was held at Jerusalem, in the month of July, 415. It was merely an assemblage of presbyters, with bishop *John* for president. *Pelagius* and the council spoke Greek; but *Orosius*, the accuser, Latin only. This gave great advantage to *Pelagius*. *Orosius* stated what had been done in Africa: *Pelagius* said he had no concern with those councils. *Orosius* was called upon to make his charges specific against

Pelagius. He then stated, that he had heard *Pelagius* affirm, that *a man may become sinless if he will*; and that *it is an easy thing to obey the law of God perfectly*. *Pelagius* explained, that he meant it should be understood, *with the aids of divine grace*. The council were satisfied with this explanation. The second council, which sat at Diospolis or Lydda, in December, 415, was composed of fourteen bishops. The accusers were two Gallic bishops, *Heros* and *Lazarus*, but neither of them was present. They sent in a long list of errors, which they said *Pelagius* and his followers had taught. *Pelagius* replied, that these were not *his* opinions, that he anathematized them, and that he believed what the Catholic church had always held. With this the council were satisfied. But the sentence of the Africans still remained in force: and therefore *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* both sought the interference of the bishop of Rome. *Tr.*]

² See *Jo. Frick, Zosimus in Clemente XI. redivivus*, Ulm. 1719, 4to [and *Bower, Lives of the Popes (Zosimus)*, i. 334, &c. *Tr.*]

³ See *Ger. Jo. Vossius, Historia Pelagiana*, i. c. 55, p. 130. There are also some learned remarks on this controversy in the *Bibliothèque Italique*, v. 74, &c. The writers on both sides are enumerated by *Jo. Fr. Buddeus, Isagoge ad Theol.* ii. 1671. *W. Wall* has likewise given a neat and learned, though imperfect, history of the Pelagian

§ 25. These unhappy contests produced, as is often the case, other dissensions equally hurtful. As *Augustine* did not at first state, with sufficient uniformity and clearness, his opinions respecting the divine grace necessary to salvation, and the decrees of God in regard to the future condition of individual men, he gave occasion to certain monks of Adrumetum and to some persons in Gaul to believe, that God has *predestinated the wicked, not only to suffer eternal punishment, but also to commit sin, and to incur the guilt which will merit that punishment*; and, of course, to believe, that *both the good and the sinful actions of men were, from all eternity, divinely predetermined and fixed, by an inevitable necessity*. These persons were called *Predestinarians*. Yet this doctrine did not spread far; for *Augustine* more clearly explained his views, and two councils, at Arles and Lyons, publicly rejected it.¹ There are, however, those who deny, very learned men, that a sect of *Predestinarians* of this kind ever existed; and who maintain that *Augustine's* followers, teaching correctly and in consonance with truth, were accused by the *Semi-Pelagians* groundlessly and contumeliously of so great an error.²

contest, in his *History of Infant Baptism*, vol. i. c. 19, which his learned translator [into Latin, J. Schlosser] has enriched with excellent remarks.

¹ See Ja. Sirmond, *Historia Prædestinatio*, Opp. iv. 271, &c. Ja. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, t. ii. liv. xii. cap. ii. p. 698. Dion. Petavius, *Dogmat. Theol.* tom. vi. p. 168, 174, &c. [According to W. Münscher (*Dogmengeschichte*, iv. 164, &c. 215, &c.), all the fathers, before *Augustine*, held to a *conditional election*; that is, an election founded on the foreseen good works of men. So Basil the Great, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome. They likewise held that Christ died for *all* men; and were strangers to the idea of an atonement made only for the *elect*. So Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Jerome. They also held, that the saints may, and do, fall from grace and perish. So Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, and Hilary. Even *Augustine* himself, in the earlier part of his ministry, held election to be conditional. But as early as the year 397, he discovered that such an election was inconsistent with man's entire dependence on grace for ability to perform good works; a doctrine which he held most firmly. He therefore advanced the new theory, that God's electing some to everlasting life, depended upon his mere good pleasure, in view of reasons known only to himself; that God from eternity predestinated some to repentance, faith, good works, and ultimately to salvation; while others he left to go on in sin, and perish everlastingly: that the number of the elect

is fixed unalterably and for ever: that this election of some to salvation through grace, while others are left without grace, and perish in their sins, is no injustice on the part of God; because *all* men *deserve* to be left in their sins. He denied that God really *wills* the salvation of all men; and he justified preaching the Gospel to all, on the ground that *we* know not who are elected and who are not. — When this theory was advanced by *Augustine*, it met with opposition; and it was not, by those who embraced it, always stated as guardedly as it was by its author. Hence, those opposed to it drew the frightful picture of it, which has been called *Predestinarianism*. This system, as stated by Dr. Münscher (*ibid.* p. 257), embraced the following positions; namely, that the wicked are predestinated, not only to punishment, but also to commit sin; that baptism does not remove all sin: that the godliness of the righteous does not profit them; nor will the wicked be damned on account of their sins; that, in general, God will not judge men according to their deeds; that it is useless to address exhortations either to saints or sinners. Dr. Münscher subjoins: All these were *consequences* drawn from the doctrine of unconditional decrees taught by *Augustine*; but they were consequences which he expressly rejected. *Tr.*]

² See Gilb. Mauguin, *Fabula Prædestinatio confutata*; which he subjoined to a *Collection* of various authors, who wrote in the ninth century concerning predestination and grace, vol. ii. p. 447, &c. Paris, 1650, 4to. [Mauguin was a French statesman, who, with much theological and historical learning, maintained with the Jansenists,

§ 26. On the one hand, *John Cassianus*, a monk who came to Marseilles in Gaul from the East, and established a monastery there, together with some others, about the year 430, endeavoured to modify in some measure the system of *Augustine*.¹ Many persons falling

against the Jesuits, that there never were any *Predestinarians*. *Schl.*] *Fred. Spanheim*, *Introduct. ad Historiam Eccles.* in his *Opp.* i. 993. — *Ja. Basnage*, *Adnot. ad Prosperi Chronicon*, and *Prefat. ad Faustum Regiensem*. *Hen. Canisius*, *Lection. Antiquar.* i. 315, 348. The author of the *Life* of *Jo. Launoi*, in his *Works*, t. iv. pt. ii. p. 343, namely, *Granet*, informs us, that *Sirmond* encouraged *Launoi* to undertake a refutation of *Mauguin*; but *Launoi*, having examined the subject, fell in with the opinions of *Mauguin*. [Father *Sirmond* was a champion of the Jesuits, who were charged by the Jansenists with departing from the opinions of *Augustine*; and he hoped to confute this charge, if he could only demonstrate, incontrovertibly, that there really was a sect of *Predestinarians* existing in the times of *Augustine*. *Sirmond* had published an ancient book at Paris, 1643, bearing the title : *Prædestinatus, sive Prædestinatorum Heresis, et libri S. Augustini temere adscripti refutatio*. The work consists of three books. The first contains a list of heresies; of which that of the *Predestinarians* is the ninetyeth. The second book bears the superscription : *Liber secundus, sub nomine Augustini confictus, nonagesimam hæresin continens, quæ asserit, Dei prædestinatione peccata committi*. The third book contains a refutation of the supposed tract of *Augustine*. This work is certainly ancient, and most probably to be ascribed to the younger *Arnobius*. But the credibility of its statements is much impaired by the fact, that its author was a *Semi-Pelagian*, and wrote more as a polemic than as an historian. *Schl.*] — This petty dispute, whether there was in ancient times a sect of *Predestinarians*, when thoroughly examined, will perhaps turn out to be a contest about terms. [To the question, whether there existed in the fifth and sixth centuries a sect of *Predestinarians*, some of the learned have answered *yes*, and others *no*. Those who answer in the latter manner, believe the sect of *Predestinarians* was a fiction of the *Semi-Pelagians*, who used this name in order to bring odium on *Augustine* and his followers. This opinion was embraced by the Jansenists, the Reformed, and among the Lutherans by *Semler*, in his history of religious doctrines, prefixed to the third volume of *Baumgarten's Polemic Theology*. Those who answer the question affirmatively, are divisible into two classes. They admit directly, that there were *Predestinarians*, who were condemned by the orthodox

church; yet they deny that *Augustine* taught what they admit to have been the errors of this sect. Of this opinion were the Jesuits, and the early Lutheran divines.] Others, while they admit all this, add, that the opposers of the sect were principally *Semi-Pelagians*, who aimed to bring contempt on the Augustinian doctrine. They hold, that only a few individual persons, as a few monks of *Adrumetum*, and *Lucidus* fell into these errors; and, therefore, they never constituted a distinct sect or heretical community. This opinion has been defended by *Noris* and *Graveson* among Romanists, by the two *Basnages* among the Reformed, and in the Lutheran church, by *Pfaff*, *Buddeus*, the elder *Walch*, and *Dr. Bernhold*, in a disputation at *Altdorf*, 1737; and it is admitted by the younger *Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. p. 280, &c. Among those who regard the whole question respecting the existence of a *Predestinarian* sect as a contest about words, besides *Dr. Mosheim*, may be reckoned *Weismann*, in his *Memorabil. Hist. Eccl.* tom. i. p. 410, &c. And, in fact, there is something like a contest about words, in the dispute whether there was really a *Predestinarian* sect. For very much depends on the definition of the word *sect* or *heresy*. If the term is used to denote a society of persons who have a particular mode of worship, then a *Predestinarian* sect never had existence. But if the term denote a set of religious opinions, embraced and defended by individual persons, here and there, but who never separated from the general church, then it may be said, there was a sect of *Predestinarians*. When we view the controversy in all its extent, we can by no means regard it as a controversy about words. See *Walch*, *Hist. Ketz.* v. 218—288. *Schl.*]

¹ [The views of *John Cassianus* are exhibited in his *Collatio* xiii. *Patrum*, *Opp.* p. 491, &c.; and are well abridged by *Dr. Münscher* (*Dogmengesch.* iv. 246, &c.) as follows. As *John Cassianus* is the only writer of those times who has exhibited a connected view of the doctrines of the so-called *Massilians*, from his works alone can the deviations of these teachers from the opinions of *Augustine* be discovered. His primary object was, to exhibit the true worth and the necessity of divine grace, but without overthrowing the freedom of the human will. Man, said he, needs at all times divine aid; and he can do nothing to secure his salvation without it. But he must not be inactive on his part. All men have indeed original sin, and are

into their views, the sect was produced, which its adversaries called that of the *Semi-Pelagians*. The sentiments of the *Semi-Pelagians* are represented differently, by those that oppose them. The greater part, however, represent them as holding, that men do not need *internal, preventing grace*; but that every man can, by his natural powers, commence the renovation of his soul, and can have and exercise faith in *Christ*, and a purpose of living a holy life: yet that no man can advance and persevere in the begun course, unless he is constantly supported by divine assistance and grace. The disciples of *St. Augustine* in Gaul, contended warmly with this class of men: but they could not vanquish them.¹ For, as their doctrines coincided

subject to death; but a knowledge of God, and their free will, they have not lost. It can neither be maintained, that the commencement of what is good in us always originates from God, nor that it always originates from ourselves. Sometimes it is of God, who first excites good thoughts and purposes in us. But sometimes it is the man who takes the first step, and whom God then meets with his assistance. In either case, it is God who, when he sees the spark of goodness glimmering in the soul, or has himself lighted it up, by his own working, cherishes and sustains this spark. God's unchangeable will is, that all men may be saved; and when any one is lost, it is contrary to his designs. At all times, therefore, the grace of God is cooperating with our will, and strengthens and defends it; yet so, that he sometimes waits for, or requires from us, some efforts to choose what is good, that he may not seem to confer his gifts on the indolent and inactive. The grace of God, however, is always unmerited, as it bestows on the weak and worthless efforts of men such valuable favours and such unfading glory. The ways in which God brings men to possess goodness, are manifold and incomprehensible; but he always treats each individual according to his character and desert. Yet this is not to be understood as if grace was imparted to each one according to his merits. On the contrary, the grace of God far transcends all human desert, and sometimes transcends the unbelief of men (i. e. brings the unbelieving to have faith). From these propositions (which are arranged differently from what they are by the author, but are expressed in almost his own words), it appears, that Cassian rejected unconditional election, the inability of man to do good, irresistible grace, and the Augustinian idea of the saints' perseverance. Dr. Münscher adds, that the principal point in which the Massilians departed from the adherents to Augustine, lay in this, that man has, in his freedom of will, some power to do good; by exerting which, he does not indeed merit

the grace of God, yet he makes himself *fit* to receive it; and that God, in view of these human efforts, has determined to bestow his grace and eternal bliss.—The *evidence* by which the Massilians supported their opinions was various. Their chief argument was this, that in the Scriptures, faith and virtue are sometimes *required* of men, and sometimes represented as the gift of God; and these different passages cannot be reconciled, unless it be allowed that faith and virtue come principally from God; and yet that free will has some part in them. This doctrine, moreover, they said, coincided with the standing belief of the church; while the opposite doctrine was new, and also objectionable, because it annihilated human freedom, introduced an unavoidable necessity in human actions, and by holding up the idea that a man's own efforts were of no avail, encouraged men to remain inactive. Tr.]

¹ Jas. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, t. ii. liv. xii. cap. i. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. ii. pref. p. ix. &c. Vossius, *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. vi. p. 538, &c. Irenæus Veronensis, i. e. Scipio Maffei, *de Hæresi Semipelagiana*, in the *Opuscula Scientifica* of Angel. Calogera, xxix. 399, &c. [As soon as Augustine was informed, by Prosper and Hilary, of the existence of these opposers of his system at Marseilles, he wrote his two pieces designed to confute them, *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum Liber*, and *de Dono Perseverantiæ Liber*, both addressed to Prosper and Hilary. Soon afterwards, A. D. 430, Augustine died; and Prosper and Hilary carried on the controversy. In 431, they visited Rome, and obtained the patronage of Celestine the pontiff: but not succeeding by means of councils and popes, Prosper applied himself to writing against the errorists. His strictures on Cassian's 13th Collation, is a valuable performance. The *Libri ii. de Vocatione Gentium* (i. e. on the universality of the call to embrace the Gospel salvation), seems not to be his; for it does not come up fully to his views, as expressed in his reply to Cassian. Though it concedes more to the Semi-Pela-

with the modes of thinking most in vogue, especially among the monks, and were agreeable besides to authorities of the greatest weight, though chiefly Greek; and since neither *Augustine* himself, nor his friends, ventured utterly to reject and condemn them as pernicious and impious, no efforts could prevent them from spreading far and wide.

§ 27. From this period, therefore, begin those most thorny controversies, concerning the nature and the mode of that divine agency, or

gians than *Augustine* and *Prosper* did, still it was on the same side. The majority in France, as well as nearly all the Greeks, were in sentiment with the Semi-Pelagians. About the year 472, one *Lucidus*, a presbyter, having avowed pure Augustinianism, *Faustus*, bishop of Riez, in Gaul, wrote him a letter, and afterwards accused him before the council of Arles, A. D. 475. The council disapproved the sentiments of *Lucidus*, who retracted; and they encouraged *Faustus* to write his two books *de Libero Arbitrio*, in opposition to *Augustine's* views. A few months after, a synod at Lyons also decided in favour of Semi-Pelagian sentiments. But early in the following century, *Cæsarius* of Arles came out a zealous Augustinian; and with the aid of some Scythian monks, and some others, he caused that doctrine to spread and to gain the ascendancy. The synods of Orange and Valence, A. D. 529, declared in favour of it. The opposers of Augustinianism were in that age denominated Pelagians, from their leaning towards the sentiments of *Pelagius*; also Massilians, from the residence of their principal writers at (Massilia) Marseilles. It was the school-men of after-ages who denominated them Semi-Pelagians.—According to *Dr. Walch*, they admitted original sin; but probably confined its effects to our liability to temporal death. They supposed all the posterity of Adam have ability to discern what is right, and freedom of will to choose it: yet that none can be saved, but by grace, through Christ, by means of his blood and a Christian baptism; that Christ died for all men; that God wills the salvation of all, and therefore proffers his grace to all, so that all men *may* be saved, if they will. The way of salvation, they suppose, is, to believe, to practise virtue, and to persevere in it to the end. Faith is, believing that God has determined to save all that obey the Gospel. This faith originates altogether from our free will. From the same source, and from the use of our natural powers, originate the beginnings of a right temper, the desiring, seeking, and knocking. Yet neither this faith, nor these beginnings of a right temper, are *good works*; that is, they have no proper efficacy to merit the

assistance of God, or that grace which is necessary to the performance of good works; and yet they may induce God to impart his grace. Thus it is God who gives the grace, by which faith is strengthened, and good works performed; yet its due influence must be allowed to free will, and not every thing be ascribed to grace. The connexion and cooperation of both are very necessary, for grace only helps or assists. True faith may be lost; its retention depends solely on man's free will; and it is not true, that divine grace imparts to man a special gift of perseverance in goodness. God has a twofold decree respecting man's salvation; *first*, his general desire that all may be saved; and *secondly*, his design actually to save those who shall persevere in holiness to the end. *Augustine's* doctrine of predestination is very objectionable; it wholly subverts man's freedom; makes God the author of sin; and renders it vain to exhort sinners to repent, or saints to persevere in religion. Election to salvation is conditional, depending on the foreseen conduct of men in regard to obedience to the divine commands. To the puzzling question of their opposers, what becomes of so many baptized children, who die before they are competent to exert their free will; and of so many adults who never were favoured with a knowledge of the Gospel; they replied, *first*, that baptized children, dying in infancy, are saved, on the ground that God foresaw they would persevere in religion if their lives had been prolonged; and *secondly*, that so many children as die without baptism, are deprived of that ordinance, and so many adults as are deprived of a knowledge of the Gospel (both being doomed to damnation), suffer these privations, because God foresaw, that the former would not live virtuously, and that the latter would not embrace the Gospel, if they had an opportunity. See *Walch, Hist. Ketz.* v. 3—218. *Tr.*—When *Augustine's* authority upon such questions is brought forward, it should be recollected that his language is that of controversy. Had not an opponent found fuel for his natural heat, he would, probably, have rested upon lower ground. &c.]

grace, which is necessary for our salvation, which have unhappily divided Christians in every subsequent age, and which are still protracted, to the grief of all the pious and good. Many have followed in all ages the system of *Augustine*, who ascribed every thing to God, nothing to human nature, although his followers disagree in explaining these things. But a still greater number have agreed with *Cassian*, whose system, though differently explained, has spread from the schools of the Gallic monks over all the nations of Europe. The Greeks and the other orientals held the same views before *Cassian*; nor have they departed from them to this day. The opinion of *Pelagius* appeared to most persons over bold and free, which has kept it from being openly avowed by large numbers. Yet in every age some may be found, who ascribed to man, as it is said *Pelagius* did, full power, by his own strength, to observe the whole law of God.

SIXTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Progress of Christianity in the East—§ 2. and in the West—§ 3. Jews converted in several places—§ 4. The miracles of this century.

§ 1. IT appears evident from the historical records of the Greek empire that several barbarous tribes, especially among those resident near the Black Sea, were converted to Christianity by the efforts of the Greek emperors and the bishops of Constantinople. Among these were the *Abasgi*, a barbarous nation inhabiting the country between the coasts of the Euxine sea and mount Caucasus, who embraced Christianity under the emperor Justinian.¹ The *Heruli*, who dwelt along the other side of the Ister, became Christians under the same reign;² also the *Alani*, the *Lazi*, and the *Zani*, and some other tribes, whose positions are not definitely known at the present day.³ But there is abundant evidence, that nothing was required of these nations except externally to profess *Christ*, cease from offering victims to their gods, and learn certain forms, like a necessary charm: while there was not even a thought of imbuing their minds with true piety and religion. It is certain that after their conversion, they retained

¹ Procopius, *de Bello Gothico*, iv. 3. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 1351, &c. [Their adoration, like that of the ancient Germans, had been previously given to forests and lofty trees. The emperor Justinian sent priests among them, and erected a church for them, dedicated to the Virgin Mary: and he rendered the people more inclined to become Christians, by prohibiting their

king from carrying on a shameful traffic in eunuchs. See the authors referred to by Mosheim. *Tr.*]

² Procopius, *de Bello Gothico*, ii. 14.

³ [See Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 20, 22, 23. All these conversions took place near the commencement of the reign of Justinian, about 430. *Tr.*]

their rude and savage manners, and were famous for rapines, murders, and every species of iniquity. In most provinces of the Greek empire, and even in the city of Constantinople, many idolaters were still lurking in concealment. A great multitude of these were baptized, during the reign of *Justin*, by *John*, bishop of Asia.¹

§ 2. In the West, *Remigius*, bishop of Rheims, who has been called the *Apostle of the Gauls*, laboured with great zeal to convert idolaters to *Christ*; and not without success, especially after *Clovis*, the king of the Franks, had embraced Christianity.² In Britain, *Ethelbert*, king of Kent, the most distinguished of the seven Anglo-Saxon kings among whom the island was then divided, married, near the close of this century, a Christian wife named *Bertha*, the daughter of *Cherebert*, king of Paris; and she, partly by her own influence, and partly by that of the ministers of religion whom she brought with her, impressed her husband favourably towards Christianity. The king being thus prepared, *Gregory* the Great, at the suggestion undoubtedly of the queen, sent forty Benedictine monks, with one *Augustine* at the head of them, into Britain, in the year 596, to complete the work which the queen had begun. This *Augustine*, with the queen's assistance, converted the king and the greatest part of the inhabitants of Kent to Christian worship, and laid the foundation of the modern British church.³ Among the *Picts* and *Scots*,

¹ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* ii. 85.

² *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 155, &c.

³ Bede, *Histor. Eccles. Gentis Anglor.* i. 23, p. 55, &c. ed. Chiflet. Rapin Thoyras, *Hist. d'Angleterre*, i. 222, &c. *Acta Sanctor.* Februar. iii. 470, where is an account of Ethelbert, king of Kent. [Bertha was the daughter of Caribert, king of Paris, by his pious and ill-used wife Ingoberga. Her father was grandson of Clovis, and brother-in-law of Brunichildis. He died in 567, and Ingoberga in 589. Bertha was married about 580, and brought with her to England Luidhard, bishop of Senlis, who officiated in the church of St. Martin, at Canterbury. Gregory before he became pope had been anxious to go as a missionary to England, but had been prevented by the people of Rome. In 596 he sent Augustine, prior of St. Andrews, at Rome, to effect the work. In Provence the missionaries lost heart, and Augustine was sent back to Gregory for leave to give up the expedition. Gregory, however, encouraged Augustine to go on, and gave him introductions to the bishops and sovereigns on the way. By the aid of Brunichildis he reached the channel and landed in Thanet with forty monks. There Ethelbert met him, promised him protection and a fair hearing, and gave him an asylum at Canterbury. The next year Ethelbert was baptized; and Augustine consecrated by the Archbishop of Arles. In 598 Laurentius

and Peter carried the report of the mission to Rome, and brought back, about 601, a pall for Augustine, relics, books, and a reinforcement of missionaries. *Ed.*] [Gregory confirmed Augustine's jurisdiction over all England, exhorted him to proceed with his work, advised him not to demolish the pagan temples, but to convert them into churches, purifying them with holy water; for the Pagans would love to worship in the places long held sacred; yet the idols must be destroyed. He also advised that the people be allowed on festal days to assemble around the churches, erect booths, and there feast themselves, much as during their Pagan state; yet without sacrificing to their idols. Gregory likewise answered several questions of Augustine, advising him and his associates to continue to live in monasteries, to use such a liturgy as should seem best suited to the country; and instructing him how thieves should be treated; how many bishops must concur in the ordination of a bishop, how he must demean himself among the Gallic bishops, and what was to be thought of some ceremonial impurities. Augustine now built his cathedral at Canterbury; and erected a monastery in which to train men for the ministry. In [601] he attempted to bring under his jurisdiction, and to a conformity with his churches, all the clergy and churches of the ancient Britons, whom the Saxons had conquered and driven chiefly into Wales. A council was held for the

Columba, an Irish monk, began the work of administering Christian baptism.¹ In Germany, the *Bohemians*, *Thuringians*, and *Bavarians*, are said to have received Christianity;² which to many, however, appears extremely doubtful. Of these holy enterprises among the heathen, no one will form a high opinion, when he shall have learned from the writers of this and the following ages, that these nations still retained a great part of their former paganism, and so worshipped Christ as to reject his precepts in their lives, deeds, and institutions.³

§ 3. A great many Jews, in various places, it is certain, made profession of Christianity. In the East, *Justinian* persuaded the Jews resident at Borium, a city of Libya, to acknowledge *Christ*.⁴ In the West, many Jews yielded to the zeal and efforts of the kings of Gaul and Spain, and to those of *Gregory* the Great, and *Avitus*.⁵ But it should be added, that far more were induced to make an external profession of Christianity, by the rewards offered by the princes, and by the fear of punishment, than by the force of arguments. In Gaul, during the reign of *Childeric*, the Jews were compelled to receive

purpose; but as *Augustine* was bigoted and overbearing, nothing was effected. In the mean time the conversion of the Saxons beyond the kingdom of Kent proceeded successfully, and bishops were ordained for London and Rochester. St. Paul's church in London was now founded. In [604 or 605] *Augustine* died, and was succeeded in the see of Canterbury by *Laurentius*. See *Bede*, *H. E.* i. 23, &c. and ii. 2, 3. *Mabillon*, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. i. ann. 596—607. The legendary history of *Augustine*, both in a larger and a smaller form, by *Goscelin*, a monk of the eleventh century, may be found in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* i. 485—543. *Tr.*]

¹ [Some rays of light had penetrated the southernmost counties of Scotland at an earlier period. *Ninias* or *Ninian* was bishop of *Whithern*, on the borders of Scotland, in the year 412; and his successors sometimes extended their labours as far north as *Glasgow*. *Kentigern* is said to have actually been bishop of *Glasgow* before the arrival of *Columba*, and to have invited this Irish missionary to visit him there. In 563 *Columba*, with twelve other monks, removed from the north of Ireland to *Iona*, *Hii*, *I*, or *I-colum-kill*, an islet on the outer shore of *Mull*, one of the larger of the *Hebrides*, or *Western isles*. The Scottish king of *Argyle*, *Brude*, or *Bride*, favoured his enterprise; and *Aidan*, a successor of *Brude*, paid him the highest reverence. *Columba* had the sole jurisdiction of his little island, which became covered with cloisters and churches, and was the residence of a numerous and learned body of monks. For several centuries *Iona* was the centre of the Scottish

church, and the place where most of her clergy were educated. There also the Scottish kings, for many generations, were interred. *Columba* died in 597. His memorable acts were recorded by *Cummenus Albus* (abbot of *Iona* from 657 to 669), and may be seen in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* i. 342, &c. and his life at large, in three books, was written by *Adamnanus*, who presided at *Iona* from 679 to 704. See *Ussher*, *Britannicar. Ecclesiar. Antiq.* cap. xv. p. 687—709. *Tr.*]

² *Henry Canisius*, *Lectiones Antiquæ*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 208. *Aventinus*, *Annal. Boiorum*; and others.

³ As to the Franks, the Benedictine monks express themselves ingenuously; *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iii. introd. p. 8, 11, 13. As to the Anglo-Saxons, see what *Gregory* the Great himself allowed of, *Epistolar.* lib. xi. ep. 76. *Opp.* ii. 1176, ed. *Benedict*. Among other things, he permitted the people, on festal days, to offer to the saints such victims as they had before offered to their gods. *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia Magnæ Britan.* i. 18, &c. [*Gregory's* words do not at all imply what *Mosheim* insinuates: he allows, that as the Pagans had been accustomed to offer sacrifices to their gods on certain feast days, so now on the day of dedication of a church, or the martyrdom of a saint, they should be allowed a holiday, and should "ad laudem Dei in esum suum animalia occidunt," giving God thanks. *Ed.*]

⁴ *Procopius*, *de Edificiis Justiniani*, lib. vi. cap. 2.

⁵ [Bishop of *Clermont*. *Tr.*]

baptism: and the same thing was done in Spain.¹ But *Gregory* the Great wished this practice to be discontinued.²

§ 4. If credit could be given unreservedly to the writers of this age, these conversions of barbarous nations to Christianity must be ascribed principally to prodigies and miracles. But observation of the nations themselves forbids us to believe these statements; for had they seen so many wonderful deeds with their own eyes, they would have had a stronger faith in Christianity, and would have more religiously obeyed its precepts. With the major part, the example and influence of their kings presented the chief argument for changing their religion. Nor were more solid reasons much needed; for the first preachers of Christianity among them, required of them nothing very difficult, or repugnant to human nature; they were only to worship the images of *Christ*, and of holy men, instead of those of their gods, and for the most part, with the same ceremonies;³ and to commit to memory certain Christian formulas. Some preachers, moreover, — as might easily be proved — deemed it lawful and right to delude the senses of ignorant men, and to make natural events popularly pass for divine interpositions.

CHAPTER II.

ADVERSE EVENTS AND OCCURRENCES.

§ 1. Pagans still remaining among the Christians — § 2. Writers opposed to Christianity —
§ 3. Persecutions and vexations.

§ 1. ALTHOUGH the imperial laws ordained that no public office should be held by any one who would not abjure paganism, yet there

¹ *Gregory of Tours, Historia Francorum*, vi. 17. *Jo. Launoï, de Veteri More Baptizandi Judæos et Infideles*, cap. i. in his *Opp.* ii. pt. ii. p. 700, 704. [All these Jewish conversions were a victory of the Christians, which did them little credit. *Avitus*, for instance, the bishop of Clermont, baptized 500 Jews. But the circumstances were these: a Jew having voluntarily received baptism, was proceeding home in the customary white robe, when meeting with some Jews, one of them poured some fetid oil on his white robe. The people soon kindled into a rage, and pulled down the synagogue; and the bishop sent word to the Jews that they must all submit to be baptized, or must quit the place. In this dilemma, 500 preferred receiving baptism, and the rest removed to Marseilles. See *Gregory of Tours, Hist. Francor.* l. v. c. 11. *Schl.*]

² See his *Epistles*, i. 47, in his *Opp.* ii. 541, ed. *Benedict*. [or the extract from it in

Baronius, Annal. ad ann. 591, t. viii. p. 26, 27, ed. Antw. 1600. Gregory commends the intentions of the Gallic bishops, but thinks that as such converts seldom persevered, and therefore exposed themselves to a heavier punishment in the other world, than if they had never been baptized, charity to them required that they should not be compelled to receive baptism. Tr.]

³ [Mosheim cites no authority for this statement, and it might seem to be far from unreservedly admissible. It is known that the Anglo-Saxons, Franks, and Germans rejected image-worship, even under a recommendation from Rome, at a much later period. It is, therefore, unlikely that they had originally combined it with Christianity. *S.* Indeed Mosheim's judgment on the missionary work of this century is harsh, and his statements too general. He seems to allow nothing for the faith of the workers, or for the blessing that followed the work, certainly in England and Ireland. *Ed.*]

were many learned and respectable men who followed the old religion in the midst of the Christians. The illustrious compiler of the Civil Law, *Tribonian*,¹ is thought by some to have been averse from the Christian religion. Of *Procopius*,² a man of acute perception, and a celebrated historian, the same suspicion is entertained by not a few. It is yet more certain that *Agathias*³ of Smyrna, an advocate at the bar, and also distinguished as an historian, was an idolater. Indeed, as is commonly the case every where, the rigour of the laws fell only on those who had neither birth, nor wealth, nor the favour of the great to protect them.

§ 2. It is still more strange that the Platonists, who were universally known to be hostile to Christianity, should have been allowed publicly to instil their principles, which are totally inconsistent with our religion, into the minds of youth both in Greece and Egypt. This class of men affected, indeed, a high degree of moderation, and, for the most part, so modified their expressions as make the pagan idolatry appear not very remote from Christianity. This is evident from the examples of *Chalcidius*⁴ and *Alexander* of Lycopolis.⁵ Yet

¹ [Tribonian was a native of Side, in Pamphylia, flourished about 527, and died about 546. Richly furnished with Greek and Roman literature, he applied himself especially to the study of law. He was advanced to various civil offices, and was in high favour with Justinian, on account of his eminent talents, and his obsequiousness. The *Codex Justinianus* was the joint work of Tribonian and others; but the compilation of the *Pandects* and *Institutes* was committed to him as chief, with others to assist him. Tribonian was avaricious and irreligious; he had been accused of atheism and paganism. The truth probably was, that he had no fixed religious principles. See J. H. Hermann, *Historia Juris Romani et Justiniani*, lib. ii. c. i. § 27, &c. and Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xlv. vol. iv. p. 360, &c. ed. New York, 1826. *Tr.*]

² [Procopius of Cæsarea (different from Procopius of Gaza) was a rhetorician, senator, and historian. He was secretary to the famous general Belisarius, from 533 to 542, during his campaigns in Asia, Africa, and Italy; and afterwards, being made a Roman senator, resided at Constantinople, and devoted himself to writing the civil history of his own times; viz. *de Bello Persico*, l. ii. *de Bello Vandalico*, l. ii. and *de Bello Gothico*, l. iv. His narration is elaborate and exact, and the style not unacceptable. He also wrote, *de Ædificiis Justiniani*, l. vi., in which he displays the munificence and greatness of that emperor: likewise *Anecdota, sive Historia Arcana*, in which he describes the vices and crimes of Justinian, and his empress Theodora. Procopius was alive in 562. He was probably a man of no religion; but, externally, a conformist to Christianity.

His works were published, Gr. and Lat., by C. Maltret, Paris, 1662, 2 vols. fol. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 510. *Tr.*]

³ [Agathias, an advocate at Smyrna, continued the history of Procopius, from 553 to 559, in five books, written in an easy but florid style. He also wrote eighty epigrams. His works were published, Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1660, fol. His history, and that of Procopius, are both in the *Corpus Historiæ Byzantinæ Scriptorum*. See Lardner, Works, ix. 85. *Tr.*]

⁴ Concerning the religion of Chalcidius, I have spoken in my notes on R. Cudworth's *Systema Intellectuale Universi*, i. 732. [See above, cent. iv. pt. i. c. i. § 18; and Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 199. *Tr.*]

⁵ The treatise of this philosopher, *contra Manicheos*, in Greek, was published by Fran. Combefis, *Auctarium Noviss. Biblioth. Patrum*, t. ii. Concerning his religion, Is. de Beausobre has given a critical dissertation, *Histoire de Manichée et Manichéisme*, pt. ii. *Discours Prélim.* § 13, p. 236, &c. [Alexander, of Lycopolis in Thebais, Egypt, flourished probably about 350. Fabricius supposes (*Biblioth. Gr.* v. 290) that he was first a pagan and a Manichee, and afterwards a catholic Christian. Cave is of the same opinion (*Hist. Lit.* t. ii. *de Scriptor. incertæ ætatis*). Beausobre (*ubi supra*) thinks he was a mere pagan. Lardner (Works, iii. 384; viii. 349, &c.) thinks he was a Gentile, but well acquainted with the Manichees and other Christians; that he had some knowledge of the Old and New Testaments, to which he occasionally refers. He speaks with respect of Christ, and the Christian philosophy; and appears to have been a learned and candid man. *Tr.*]

there were some among them who did not hesitate openly to attack the Christian religion. *Damascius*, in his life of his master *Isidore*, and elsewhere, casts many reproaches on the Christians.¹ *Simplicius*, in his Expositions of Aristotle, not obscurely carps at the Christian faith.² The *Epicheiremata xviii. contra Christianos*, written by *Proclus*,³ were in every body's hands; and therefore received a confutation from *John Philoponus*.⁴ So much licence would not have been allowed to these men, had there not been among the magistrates many who were Christians in name and outward appearance, rather than in reality.

§ 3. The Christians in some places had occasion, even in this century, to complain of the barbarity and cruelty of their enemies. During the greater part of it, the Anglo-Saxons, who had seized upon Britain, brought every kind of calamity and suffering upon the former inhabitants of the country, who were Christians.⁵ The *Huns*, having made an irruption into Thrace, Greece, and other provinces, during the reign of *Justinian*, treated the Christians with cruelty;⁶ yet they appear to have been influenced, not so much by a hatred of Christianity, as by hostility to the Greek empire. A great change in the state of Italy took place about the middle of this century, under *Justinian I.* This emperor, by *Nurses* his general, overturned the kingdom of the Ostrogoths in that country, after it had stood ninety years, and annexed Italy to his empire. But during the reign of *Justin*, the Lombards, a very warlike German tribe, under their king *Alboin*, and accompanied by some other German people, broke into Italy from Pannonia, in the year 568; and having possessed them-

¹ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Cod. cexlii. p. 1027. [*Damascius* was a native of *Damascus*, but studied and taught philosophy at Athens and Alexandria. From the latter he fled to Persia, during the persecution of the pagan philosophers by *Justinian*, about 530. His subsequent history is unknown. He wrote the lives of *Isidorus* and others, Commentaries on Plato, and four books on extraordinary events: all of which are lost. Photius calls him *εἰς ἄκρον δυσσεβῆς*, superlatively irreligious (*Codex clxxxi.*), and gives an epitome of his life of *Isidore*, *Cod. cexlii. Tr.*]

² [*Simplicius*, a native of Cilicia, a disciple of *Damascius*, and an eclectic philosopher, fled into Persia about 530. He returned a few years after, and wrote Commentaries on some of the works of Aristotle: also on the *Encheiridion* of *Epictetus*; both edited, Greek and Latin, by H. Wolf, *Leyden*, 1640, 4to. *Tr.*]

³ [*Proclus* was born at Constantinople, in 410, studied at Alexandria and at Athens, and became head of the philosophical school in the latter place, in 450. He died in 485. He was a man of much philosophical reading, a great enthusiast, a bold and whimsical speculator, and a most

voluminous writer. His eighteen arguments against the Christians are so many proofs that the world was eternal. This work, with the confutation of *John Philoponus*, was published in Greek, Venice, 1535, fol.; and in Latin, Lyons, 1557, fol. *Tr.*]

⁴ See J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* iii. 522, &c. [and Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 491, with Hamberger's *Zuverlässige Nachrichten*, iii. 391. *Schl.*]

⁵ Ja. Ussher, *Index Chronolog. Antiq. Eccles. Britan. ad ann.* 508, p. 1123 [and still more to the purpose, *ad ann.* 511, p. 1125, and *ad ann.* 597, p. 1151, &c. At the beginning of this century, the Saxons held only Kent and Sussex, all the rest of the country was inhabited by Christian Britons. But during this century, the Saxons gradually extended their conquests; and before the century closed, the Britons were shut up among the mountains of Wales and Cornwall, except a few in Cumberland on the borders of Scotland, or were driven to take refuge beyond seas. Over all the rest of England paganism reigned: the churches were demolished, or converted into idolatrous temples, and the public worship of the true God had ceased. *Tr.*]

⁶ Procopius, *de Bello Persico*, ii. 4.

selves of the whole country, except Rome and Ravenna, founded a new kingdom at Pavia. Under these new masters, who were not only barbarians, but also averse from Christianity, the Italian Christians for a time endured immense evils and calamities. But the first rage gradually subsided, and the Lombards became more civilised. *Autharis*, their third king, made a profession of Christianity, in the year 587; but he embraced the Arian creed. His successor, however, *Agilulph*, was induced by his queen, *Theodelinda*, to abandon the Arian sect, and join the Nicene catholics.¹ *Chosroes*, the king of Persia, exceeded all others in barbarity; for he publicly declared that he would make war, not upon *Justinian*, but upon the God of the Christians; and he cut off an immense number of Christians by various modes of execution.²

¹ Paulus Diaconus, *de Gestis Longobardorum*, ii. 2; and 27, p. 219, 231, ed. Lindenberg. Muratori, *Antiq. Italiæ*, i. 14; ii.

297, &c.; and *Annales Italici*. Giannone, *Histoire de Naples*, i. 302, &c.

² Procopius, *de Bello Persico*, ii. 26.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. The state of learning in the West — § 2. The sciences badly taught — § 3. The study of philosophy — § 4. State of learning among the Greeks — § 5. and in the East.

§ 1. EVERY one knows, that the irruption of the fierce and barbarous nations into most of the provinces of the West, was extremely prejudicial to literature, and to every species of learning. All the liberal arts and sciences would have become wholly extinct, had they not found some sort of refuge among the bishops and monks. To most of those churches which are called *cathedrals*, schools were annexed, in which either the bishop himself, or some one appointed by him, instructed the youth in the seven liberal arts, as a preparation for the study of the sacred books.¹ The monks and nuns were nearly all required, by the founders of their houses, to devote some portion of every day to the reading of the ancient doctors of the church, who were supposed to have exhausted the fountains of sacred knowledge.² It was, therefore, necessary that libraries should be formed in the monasteries, and that books should be multiplied by transcribing. This labour of transcription was generally assigned to the more feeble-bodied monks, who were unable to encounter severe labour. To this arrangement we owe the preservation of all the ancient authors that have come down to us, both sacred and profane. Moreover, in most of the monasteries, schools were opened, in which the abbot or some one of the monks gave literary instruction to the children and youth that were devoted to a monastic life.³

¹ Claude Fleury, *Discours sur l'Histoire Ecclésiastique depuis l'an 600*, &c. § xxi. &c. in his *Hist. Ecclés.* xiii. 56. *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, iii. Introd. § xxxii. p. 12, &c. Herm. Conringius, *Antiquit. Academiæ*, p. 66—167, ed. Heu-
[Gregory of Tours, vi. 36. *Schl.*]
- Benedict of Anian, *Concordia Regu-*

larum, l. ii. p. 55, 64, 75, 77, 80, 100; l. iii. p. 16—41, &c. ed. Hug. Menard. Jo. Mabillon, *Pref. ad Sæcul. i. Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* p. xliv. &c.

³ Benedict. *Concordia Regular.* lib. ii. p. 232. Joh. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* i. 314, &c.

§ 2. But, not to mention that many of the bishops and of those who governed monks, were inattentive to their duty; and that others had strong prejudices against learning and science, from which they apprehended no little danger to piety—a fault commonly attributed to *Gregory* the Great, bishop of Rome, who, it is said, wished to have many of the ancient authors committed to the flames;¹—not to mention, also, that some of the bishops, of set purpose, cultivated ignorance and barbarism, which they confounded with Christian simplicity; to pass over these considerations, it remains to be stated, that the branches of learning taught in these schools, were confined within very narrow limits;² and that the teachers were ignorant and incompetent. Greek literature was almost every where neglected; and those who professed to cultivate Latin, consumed their time on grammatical subtilties and niceties; as is manifest from the examples of *Isidorus* and *Cassiodorus*. Eloquence had degenerated into a sort of rhetorical bombast, sustained by incongruous and frigid figures couched in barbarous terms. This even those will show who wrote with more elegance than the rest, as *Boëthius*, *Cassiodorus*, *Ennodius*, and others. The other liberal arts, as they were called, contained nothing elevated and liberal; but consisted of only a few precepts, and those very dry.

§ 3. Philosophy was wholly excluded from those schools which were directed by the sacred order; for nearly all thought that men dedicated to God could do very well without it, or rather ought never to meddle with it. The most eminent, and indeed almost the only Latin philosopher of this age, was the celebrated *Boëthius*, privy councillor to *Theodoric*, king of the Ostrogoths in Italy. He embraced the *Plutonic* system;³ but, like most of the younger Platonists, approved also the precepts of *Aristotle*, and illustrated them by his writings. He is therefore not improperly regarded as a man, whose labours brought the Aristotelian philosophy into higher repute, among the Latins, than it had hitherto enjoyed.

§ 4. Among the Greeks, the liberal arts were cultivated with more zeal, in several places; and some of the emperors encouraged with honours and rewards every branch of learning;⁴ yet the number of

¹ Gabr. Liron, *Singularités Historiques et Littér.* tom. i. p. 166, &c. [Schlegel in a note on this place accuses Gregory of discountenancing all secular (pagan?) learning, and harshly attacking Desiderius of Vienne for lecturing on the pagan poets. *Greg. Ep.* ix. 48. The charge is much exaggerated, and must, such as it is, be borne by all the early Christians, in common with Gregory. The stories that he burned the Palatine library, (Joh. Salisb. *de Nugis Curialium*, ii. 26, and viii. 19), and Livy's History (Antoninus of Florence, *ap. Voss. de Historicis Latinis*, p. 98), which Schlegel half sanctions, are exploded fables. The statement of the text goes probably as far as truth will allow.

Schlegel or his translator grossly mistranslates the passage from Gregory's letter to Desiderius. *Ed.*]

² See M. Aurel. Cassiodorus, *de septem Disciplinis Liber*; among his *Works*.

³ This will be evident to any one who, with some knowledge of the views of the younger Platonists, takes up his books *de Consolatione Philosophiæ*. See also Renat. Vallinus, *Notes*, p. 10, 50. Luc. Holstenius, *de Vita Porphyrii*, p. 7, ed. Cantabr.; likewise, Jo. Jac. Mascov, *Historia Germanorum*, ii. 102, &c. [Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* iii. 524, &c.; and Hamberger's *Zuverlässige Nachrichten*, iii. 317, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ See the *Codex Theodos.* t. ii. lib. vi. p.

the men of genius is found much smaller than in the preceding century. When this century commenced, the younger *Platonism* was flourishing in full splendour. The schools of Alexandria and Athens were under masters of high credit, *Damascius*, *Isidore*,¹ *Simplicius*, *Eulalius*, *Hermias*, *Priscian*, and others. But when the emperor *Justinian*, by an express law, forbade the teaching of philosophy at Athens² (which is undoubtedly to be understood of this species of philosophy), and manifested peculiar displeasure against those who would not renounce idolatry, all these philosophers took up their residence among the Persians, the enemies of the Romans.³ They returned again, indeed, in the year 533, on the restoration of peace between the Persians and the Romans;⁴ but they were never able to recover their former credit, and they gradually ceased to keep up their schools. Such was the termination of this sect, which had been a most troublesome one to the church for many centuries. On the contrary, the *Aristotelian* philosophy gradually emerged from its obscurity, and received explanations, particularly from the commentaries of *John Philoponus*. And it became necessary for the Greeks to acquaint themselves with it, because the *Monophysites* and *Nestorians* endeavoured to confute adherents to the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon by arguments borrowed from the *Peripatetics*.

§ 5. For the *Nestorians* as well as the *Monophysites*, who lived in the East, kept *Aristotle* in their eye; and to make their adherents good disputants, translated his principal works out of Greek into their vernacular tongues. In the Syriac language, *Sergius Rasainensis*, a *Monophysite* and a philosopher, brought out *Aristotle*.⁵ In Persia, one *Uranius*, a Syrian, propagated his doctrines; and even instilled them into the mind of *Chosroes*, the king, who was studious of such matters.⁶ Another, who was doubtless of the *Nestorian* sect (for no other in this age prevailed in Persia, the Greeks being excluded), presented the king with a Persian translation of *Aristotle*.⁷

113, &c. Herm. Conringius, *de Studiis urbis Romæ et Constantinop.* annexed to his *Diss. de Antiquit. Academicis*.

¹ [See Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* ii. 341. Isidore was called Gazæus, from his native place, Gaza in Palestine; and this discriminated him from Isidore Mercator, Hispanensis, and Pelusiota. *Schl.*]

² Johannes Malala, *Historia Chronica*, pt. ii. p. 187. ed. Oxon. Another testimony to the same point, derived from, I know not what, unpublished *Chronicon*, is adduced by Nicol. Alemannus, *ad Procopii Historiam Arcanam*, c. 26, p. 377, ed. Venetæ. [Also Agathias, cap. ii. and Suidas, art. *εὐρέσθης*, t. iii. 171, seem to refer to this event, by saying: *Damascius*, *Simplicius*, *Eulalius*, *Priscianus*, *Hermias*, *Diogenes*, and *Isidorus*, retired to Persia, because they could not live according to their inclinations. *Schl.*]

³ Agathias, *de Rebus Justiniani*, lib. ii. *Corpus Byzant.* iii. 49, ed. Venetæ.

⁴ Consult the excellent Peter Wesselingius, *Observat. Variar.* l. i. c. 18, p. 117.

⁵ Georgius Abulpharajus, *Historia Dynastiar.* p. 94, 172, ed. of Pocock.

⁶ Agathias, *de Rebus Justiniani*, lib. ii. p. 48. That this *Uranius* accommodated the precepts of *Aristotle* to the Eutychian controversies, appears from this, that Agathias represents him as disputing about the *possibility* and *immiscibility* of God, *καὶ τὸ παθητὸν καὶ ἀσύγχυτον*. [*Uranius* was in so high esteem with *Chosroes*, that he had him constantly at his table. He wished to be accounted a sceptic; but may more justly be ranked among the *Nestorians*, than among the proper philosophers. *Schl.*]

⁷ Agathias, *de Rebus Justiniani*, lib. ii. p. 48, ed. Venetæ.

Yet there were among these Christians some who, rejecting both *Plato* and *Aristotle*, chose to philosophize or speculate according as their own genius led them. Such was the Nestorian *Cosmas*, called *Indicopleustes*; whose opinions were quite peculiar, and more contemporaneous with those of the orientals, than with those of the Greeks.¹ Such also was the writer, from whose *Exposition of the Octateuch*, *Photius* has preserved some extracts.²

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS IN THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Contests between the bishops of Constantinople and Rome—§ 2. Endeavours of the latter to obtain supreme power—§ 3, 4. Corrupt lives of the Clergy—§ 5. The monks—§ 6. Order of Benedict—§ 7. Its propagation—§ 8. Principal authors among the Greeks—§ 9. Latin writers.

§ 1. In the outward form of the Christian commonwealth there was no important change. But the two prelates of Rome and Constantinople, who seemed to themselves and others heads of the whole church, were incessantly striving with each other for the lead, and for extending the limits of their jurisdictions. The bishop of Constantinople not only claimed the primacy in the eastern churches, but also maintained that his church was in no respect inferior to that of Rome. The pontiffs of Rome were, however, exceedingly disturbed at this, and claimed for *their* church an eminence and dignity above that of Constantinople. In particular, the Roman pontiff, *Gregory* the Great, did so; when, in the year 587, *John* of Constantinople, surnamed the *Faster*, on account of the austerity of his life, had by his own authority assembled a council of eastern bishops at Constantinople, to decide on charges brought against *Peter*³ bishop of Antioch; and on this occasion had arrogated to himself the title of *œcumenical* or

¹ Bernh. de Montfaucon, *Præf. ad Cosmam*, p. x. &c., in his *Collectio Nov. Patr. Græcorum*. [This Cosmas was an Egyptian monk. In early life he was a merchant, and made voyages the whole length of the Red Sea, and even to India; whence he got the name of *Indicopleustes*, or *Indian Navigator*. After many years spent in this manner, he took up residence in a monastery in Egypt, and devoted himself to composing books. His chief work is *Topographia Christiana sive Christianorum opinio de mundo*, in twelve books. It is his great aim to prove the earth not spherical, but a vast oblong plain;

the length, east and west, being double the breadth. He argues from Scripture, reason, testimony, and the authority of the fathers. But while pressing his main point, he introduces much valuable geographical information, which he had collected in his voyages. He flourished, and probably wrote about 535. The best edition is that of Montfaucon, Greek and Latin, in *Collect. Nov. Patr. Gr.* t. ii. Paris, 1706. See Cave's *Hist. Lit.* i. 515, &c. Tr.]

² Photius, *Biblioth.* Cod. xxxvi. p. 22, 23.

³ [Gregory. Tr.]

universal bishop.¹ For, although the bishops of Constantinople had long used this title, which was capable of a harmless interpretation, yet *Gregory* concluded, from the time and the occasion on which it was now used, that John was aiming at a supremacy over all Christian churches; and he therefore wrote letters to the emperor, and to others, in which he vehemently inveighed against this title. But he could effect nothing; and the bishops of Constantinople continued to assume it, though not in the sense which *Gregory* supposed.²

§ 2. The bishop of Rome persevering in his opposition, excited commotion every where, in order to bring the Christian world under his own control. And he was in some degree successful, especially in the West; but in the East, scarcely any would listen to him, unless actuated by hostility to the bishop of Constantinople; and this last was always in a condition to oppose his ambitious designs in that quarter. How greatly the ideas of many had advanced respecting the powers of the bishop of Rome, cannot better be shown than by the example of *Ennodius*, the insane flatterer of *Symmachus*; who, among other extravagant expressions, said, *the pontiff judges in the place of God*.³ But, on the other hand, there are numerous proofs that the emperors, as well as some whole nations, would not patiently bear this new yoke.⁴ The Gothic kings in Italy would not allow the bishop of Rome to domineer excessively there; nor would they allow any one to be considered as pontiff whom they had not approved;

¹ [Mosheim here confounds dates, names, and transactions. *Gregory* (not *Peter*), bishop of Antioch, being accused of incest and other crimes, appealed from the tribunal of the governor of the East, to the emperor *Mauricius*; and the emperor (not the patriarch *John*) called a council at Constantinople, in 587, composed of patriarchs (or their delegates), Roman senators, and metropolitans, to hear and decide the case. (*Evagrius*, *H. E.* vi. 7. *Evagrius* was *Gregory's* counsellor at the trial, and has given us nearly all the information which has reached us respecting this council.) On this occasion, *John*, the patriarch of Constantinople, took the title of *universal bishop*—a title which had for some time been used by the bishops of that see. The decisions of this council being sent to *Pelagius II.* (not to *Gregory the Great*), bishop of Rome, he confirmed the acquittal of *Gregory*, but remonstrated strongly against the title given to *John*. His letters on the occasion are lost, but are mentioned by his successor. In 590, *Pelagius* died, and was succeeded by *Gregory the Great*; and he, finding that *John* continued to use this title, took up the business in earnest, about 595, and for some years laboured by intreaties and threats, and continued applications to the emperors and to the other patriarchs, to divest the Constantinopolitan patriarchs of a title which he

maintained to be *profane, anti-christian, and infernal*, by whomsoever assumed. See *Gregory the Great*, *Ep.* iv. 36, 38, and vi. 39, &c. *Bower's Lives of the Popes* (*Pelagius II.*), ii. 469, and (*Gregory*) ii. 505, 511, 517. *Natalis Alexander*, *Hist. Eccles. sæcul.* vi. cap. ii. art. 12, 13, t. x. 18, 25, &c. *Tr.*]

² *Gregory the Great*, *Epist.* iv. v. vi. All the passages in these Epistles, relating to this important subject, are collected and illustrated by *Jo. Launoy*, *Assertio in Privilegium S. Medardi*, Opp. t. iii. pt. ii. p. 266, &c. See *Mich. le Quien*, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 67, &c. *Chr. Matth. Pfaff*, *Diss. de Titulo Œcumenicus*; in the *Tempe Helvetica*, iv. 99, and the authors there mentioned. [The title of *Servant of the servants of God*, said to have been assumed by *Gregory* in reproof of *John the Faster*, was not invented by him, but had been used by *St. Augustine*, and was used by other bishops until the eleventh century. *Gieseler*, ii. 132. *Robertson*, ii. 10. *Ed.*]

³ *Vice Dei judicare*. See his *Apologeticus pro Synodo*, in the *Biblioth. Mag. Patr.* xv. 248, ed. Paris.

⁴ See, particularly respecting Spain, *Mich. Geddes*, *On the Papal Supremacy, chiefly with relation to the ancient Spanish church*; published among his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, ii. 1. &c.

and they wished to have his election controlled by their decisions.¹ These kings also enacted laws relative to religious matters, arraigned the clergy before their tribunals, and summoned ecclesiastical councils.² And the pontiffs themselves paid homage to these sovereigns, and afterwards to the emperors, in a submissive manner; for they had not yet become so lost to all shame, as to think the lords of human things vassals of their own.³

§ 3. Not only great privileges, but also great riches, had already been gained by the sacred order, and in this age superstition daily added something to both. For it was supposed, that sins might be expiated by munificence to churches and monks; and that the prayers of saints in heaven, which were most efficacious with God, might be purchased, by presents offered in temples dedicated to themselves.⁴ This increase of wealth and privileges was accompanied with an equal increase of the vices usually attendant on affluence, in the clergy of all ranks, from the highest to the lowest;⁵ as is manifest even from the laws enacted by councils and by the emperors to regulate the lives and morals of those who are called *Clerks*.⁶ For what need could there be to fence the morals of these men within so many laws, if they had shown any love for virtue and piety? The efficacy of all this legislation was, however, slight; for so great was the reverence for clergymen, that even their most atrocious offences were visited with the gentlest chastisement; and thus, they felt a disposition to venture upon anything.

§ 4. What sort of men the bishops of Rome were, who wished to

¹ See Joh. Ja. Mascov. *Historia Germanorum*, ii. 113, note.

² Ja. Basnage, *Hist. des Eglises Réformées*, i. 381, &c. [Thus e.g. Theodoric assembled the Italian bishops at Rome, to settle the contested election of Symmachus to the papal chair. (Walch, *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* 347.) The council of Orleans, in 511, was held by order of Clovis. (Ibid. 351.) Another at Orleans, in 533, by order of Childebert. (Ibid. 367.) And in 549. (Ibid. 375.) And at Clermont, by order of Theudebert. (Ibid. 368.) *Schl.*]

³ See the collections from Gregory the Great, by Jo. Launoy; *de Regia Potestate in Matrimon.* Opp. t. i. pt. ii. p. 691, &c. and *Assertio in Privilegium S. Medardi*, Opp. t. iii. pt. ii. p. 275. Giannone, *Histoire de Naples*, ii. 282, &c.

⁴ [Thus, e.g. Gregory (in cap. xv. Job. l. xii. c. 23,) says: 'Whenever, after committing a crime, we give alms, we do, as it were, compensate for our wicked actions.' *Schl.*]

⁵ [Theophanes (on the second year of Justinian) states, that Esaias, bishop of Rhodes, and Alexander, bishop of Diospolis in Thrace, were, for the crime of sodomy, deprived of their offices, and castrated by order of the emperor; and then carried about

as a show, with a herald proclaiming: 'All ye bishops, beware of disgracing your venerable office.' So in the Epistles of Gregory the Great, many proofs occur of impure conduct among the clergy: e.g. l. viii. ep. 11, l. iii. ep. 26 and 9, l. i. ep. 18, 42. *Schl.*]

⁶ Qui *Clerici* vocantur. [Thus, e.g. in the council of Agde in Gaul, (can. 41,) it was enacted, that a clergyman who should get drunk, should be excluded the church for thirty days, or undergo corporal punishment: and (can. 42,) the clergy were forbidden to exercise the art of fortune-telling. Harduin's *Concilia*, ii. 1002. Other laws forbid simony, concubinage, perjury, usury, and gaudy dress, in the clergy. In Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 529, mention is made of many nuns, at the head of whom were two princesses, Chrotildis and Basine, who broke from the nunnery at Poitiers, and who were a part of them found pregnant, and also committed the most shameful acts of violence. And in page 531, he mentions one Ægidius, bishop of Rheims, who used forged documents before the council of Metz; and, for treasonable practices, was removed from office. See Fleury, *Ecclesiast. History*; the German translation, v. 413, 417. *Schl.*]

he thought the chiefs and fathers of the whole Christian church, and also the body of the clergy under them at Rome, best appears from the long and violent contest between *Symmachus* and *Laurentius*; which broke out in the year 498, and was at length settled by the Gothic king *Theodoric*. Each maintained that he himself was the pontiff regularly appointed, and each accused the other of detestable wickednesses; nor do either's charges appear untrue. Three councils, assembled at Rome, were not able to terminate the dreadful quarrel; in the fourth, *Theodoric* having taken up the business, soon after the commencement of the century, *Symmachus* was at length pronounced innocent. But the adverse party continued to deny that justice had been done *them* by this decision; and this led *Ennodius* of Pavia to write his *Apology for the council and for Symmachus*.¹ From this treatise, which abounds in rhetorical colouring, we may clearly learn, that the foundations of that exorbitant power which the pontiffs afterwards obtained, were already laid; but not that *Symmachus* had been inconsiderately and unjustly accused.

§ 5. The progress of monkery was very great, both in the East and in the West. In the East, whole armies of monks might have been enrolled, without any sensible diminution of the number anywhere. In the West, this mode of life found patrons and followers, almost without number, in all the provinces: as may appear from the various rules drawn up by different individuals, for regulating the lives of monks and nuns.² In Great Britain one *Congal* is said to have per-

¹ This Apology is extant in the *Biblioth. Magn. Patr.* xv. 248, &c. [and in most of the Collections of Councils.—On the death of Pope Anastasius, in 498, not only the clergy, but the people and the senate of Rome, were divided about a successor. Symmachus, a deacon, and Laurentius, the arch-presbyter, were both chosen on the same day by their respective partisans: and so eager were both parties, that the whole city was in an uproar, and many battles and much bloodshed took place in the streets and in the public places. To end the contest, the leading men on both sides agreed to refer the point to the decision of Theodoric, the Arian king at Ravenna. He decided, that the one who should be found to have had most votes, and to have been elected at the earliest hour, should be considered the legal pontiff. This secured the election of Symmachus. The king likewise ordered the bishops to make regulations for the election of future popes, which should prevent the recurrence of similar difficulties. This was done in 499. But the party of Laurentius were not yet quiet. In 500, they accused Symmachus of several heinous crimes before the king; and the tumults and civil wars of Rome were renewed with increased violence. Some senators informed the king of the state of Rome, and requested him to send a visitor to Rome, with full powers to settle all the difficulties.

Peter, bishop of Altino, was appointed. He repaired to Rome, and at once suspended Symmachus, and took the goods of the church into his own hands. This enraged the partisans of Symmachus to madness, and prostrated all order and subordination. Being apprised of the state of things, the king now repaired to Rome in person, and spent six months in tranquillising that distracted city. He ordered all the bishops of Italy to meet in council, and decide on the charges against Symmachus. The council held several meetings in that and the following years. Symmachus, when sent for, set out to go to the council, attended by a mob: a battle ensued in the streets; several were killed; Symmachus himself was wounded, turned back, and refused to appear before the council. The council, after some delay, proceeded in his absence; decreed that the witnesses, being slaves, were incompetent to prove anything; and therefore dismissed the complaint. The friends of Laurentius protested against the decision. The council met again, and adopted as their own the apology for them drawn up by Ennodius. See Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, (*Symmachus*) ii. 248—261. Harduin, *Concilia*, ii. 961, &c. 975, 983, 989. Tr.]

² Most of these Rules are extant, in Lu. Holstein's *Codex Regularum*, pt. ii. published at Rome, 1661, in 3 vols. 4to. Add

suaded an immense number to abandon active life, and spend their days in solitude according to a rule which he prescribed.¹ His disciples filled Ireland, Gaul, Germany, Switzerland, and other countries, with abodes of monks. The most famous of them was *Columbanus*, who has left us a rule of his own, distinguished for its simplicity and brevity.² The whole monastic order abounded with fanatics and profligates. In the oriental monasteries, however, the fanatics preponderated; in the western, a majority were knaves.

§ 6. A new order of monks, which in time absorbed all the others in the West, was established at mount *Cassino*, in the year 529, by *Benedict* of Nursia, a devout and a distinguished man, according to the standard of that age. His *Rule* is still extant; and it shows that it was not his aim to bring all monks under his regulations, but rather to found a new society, more stable, of better morals, and living under milder rules than the other monks; the members of which should lead a retired and holy life, employed in prayers, reading, manual labour, and the instruction of youth.³ But his followers departed

Edm. Martene and Ursin. Durand, *The-saurus novus Anecdotorum*, i. 4.

¹ Ja. Ussher, *Antiq. Eccles. Britan.* p. 132, 441, 911. [Congal, or Congellus, was an Irish monk, who founded several monasteries; the most important of which was that of Banchor, or Bangor, (on the south shore of Carrickfergus bay, in the north-east of Ireland,) erected about 530. Congal is said to have ruled over 3,000 monks, living in different monasteries and cells. See Ussher, loc. cit. Tr.]

² Ja. Ussher, *Sylloge Antiquar. Epistolar. Hibernicarum*, p. 5—15. Lu. Holstein, *Codex Regular.* ii. 48, &c. Mabillon, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* sæcul. ii. p. iv. [St. Columbanus (a different person from Columba, the apostle of Scotland, mentioned cent. vi. p. i. c. 1, *supra*,) was born in Leinster, about 559. After a good education in the literature of that age, he became a monk at Bangor, under Congal. In 589, with twelve companions, he passed through England into Gaul; and settled in Burgundy, where he built the monastery of Luxeuil, or Luxovium; and there spent about twenty years with great reputation. But in 610, having offended Theodoric the king, by reproving his vices, he was banished; and after wandering a few years in different parts of Gaul and Germany along the Rhine, and spending three years near Bregentz, in Helvetia, he went into Italy; was received kindly by Agilulph the Lombard king, built the monastery of Bobbio near Pavia, presided over it one year, and then died about 615. He was a man of superior genius, and possessed vast influence. His works yet remaining are, his monastic rule; his monastic discipline;

some poems and epistles; and seventeen discourses; which were published at Louvain in 1667, by Patrick Fleming, an Irish monk. His life, written by Jonas, an abbot of Bobbio, while several contemporaries of Columbanus were yet living, is extant in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* ii. 2—26. Tr.]

³ See Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* i. and *Annales Ord. Benedict.* t. i. Helyot, [*Histoire des Ordres monastiques religieux et militaires*, &c. in 8 vols. 4to, Paris, 1714—19,] and the other historians of the monastic orders.—[Benedict was born of rather superior parentage at Norcia, generally written *Nursia*, in Italy, [once an episcopal see, not far from Spoleto, in Umbria, &c.] A. D. 480. At the age of fourteen, he was sent to Rome for education; but, disgusted with the dissipations of the city and the school, he soon ran away, and concealed himself three years in a cave [dedicated anciently, it seems, to Faunus,] at *Sublacum* [Subiaco] 44 miles from Rome. At length he was discovered, and his cell became much frequented. He was now chosen abbot of a monastery in the vicinity; but the rigour of his discipline gave offence, and he relinquished the office, and returned to Sublacum, where he continued till about 529. Many monks here joined him, and he had twelve cells, each containing twelve monks, under his jurisdiction. Many of the first Roman families placed their sons under his instruction; and his reputation for piety and for miracles procured him almost unbounded respect. But his fame excited the envy of some clergymen, and led to plots against his life. After twenty-five years spent at Sublacum, he retired to

widely from the principles of their founder; for, after they had acquired immense riches, from the liberality of princes and pious individuals, they gave themselves up to luxury, idleness, and every vice; became involved in civil affairs and the cabals of courts; intent on multiplying vain and superstitious rites, and most eager to advance

mount Cassino, about 50 miles south of Sublacum, and about as far from Naples. Here he converted a body of pagan mountaineers, and turned their temple into a monastery, in which he spent the remainder of his days in quietude and honour. He died about 543. His life was written by pope Gregory the Great, and constitutes the second book of his *Dialogue*: it is also inserted in Mabillon's *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Ben.* sæc. i. 1—25.—According to the *Rule* of Benedict, the monks were to rise at 2 A.M. in winter, (and in summer at such hours as the abbot might direct,) repair to the place of worship for vigils; and then spend the remainder of the night in learning psalms, private meditation, and reading. At sunrise, they assembled for matins; then spent four hours in labour; then two hours in reading; then dined, and read in private till half-past two P.M., when they met again for worship; and afterwards laboured till their vespers. In their vigils and matins, twenty-four Psalms were to be chanted each day; so as to complete the Psalter every week. Besides their social worship, seven hours each day were devoted to labour, two at least to private study, one to private meditation, and the rest to meals, sleep, and refreshment. The labour was agriculture, gardening, and various mechanical trades; and each one was put to such labour as his superior saw fit; for they all renounced wholly every species of personal liberty. They ate twice a day at a common table; first, about noon, and then at evening. Both the quantity and the quality of their food were limited. To each was allowed one pound of bread per day, and a small quantity of wine. On the public table no meat was allowed, but always two kinds of porridge. To the sick, flesh was allowed. While at table all conversation was prohibited; and some one read aloud the whole time. They all served as cooks and waiters, by turns of a week each. Their clothing was coarse and simple, and regulated at the discretion of the abbot. Each was provided with two suits, a knife, a needle, and all other necessities. They slept in common dormitories of ten or twenty, in separate beds, without undressing, and had a light burning, and an inspector sleeping in each dormitory. They were allowed no conversation after they retired; nor at any time were they permitted to jest, or to talk for mere amusement. No one could receive

a present of any kind, not even from a parent; nor have any correspondence with persons without the monastery, except by its passing under the inspection of the abbot. A porter always sat at the gate, which was kept locked day and night; and no stranger was admitted without leave from the abbot, and no monk could go out unless by his permission. The school for the children of the neighbourhood was kept without the walls. The whole establishment was under an abbot, whose power was despotic. His under-officers were a prior or deputy, a steward, a superintendent of the sick and the hospital, an attendant on visitors, a porter, &c. with the necessary assistants, and a number of deans, or inspectors over tens, who attended the monks at all times. The abbot was elected by the common suffrage of the brotherhood; and when inaugurated, he appointed and removed his under-officers at pleasure. On great emergencies, he summoned the whole brotherhood to meet in council; and on more common occasions, only the seniors; but in either case, after hearing what each one was pleased to say, the decision rested wholly with himself. For admission to the society, a probation of twelve months was required; during which the applicant was fed and clothed, and employed in the meaner offices of the monks, and closely watched. At the end of his probation, if approved, he took solemn and irrevocable vows of perfect chastity, absolute poverty, and implicit obedience to his superiors in everything. If he had property, he must give it all away, either to his friends or the poor, or the monastery; and never after must possess the least particle of private property, nor claim any personal rights or liberties. For lighter offences, a reprimand was to be administered by some under-officer. For greater offences, after two admonitions, a person was debarred his privileges, not allowed to read in his turn, or to sit at table, or enjoy his modicum of comforts. If still refractory, he was expelled the monastery; yet might be restored on repentance. See the *Rule*, at large, in Hospinian, *Opp.* iv. (*de Monachis*, libri vii.) 202—222. ed. Genev. 1669, fol. and as abridged by Fleury, *Histoire Ecclési.* lib. xxxii. § 14—19. Yet it is questionable whether the *Rule*, as there laid down, was precisely what Benedict prescribed. *Tr.*]

the authority and power of the Roman pontiffs. None of these things were enjoined or permitted by *St. Benedict*; whose Rule, though still highly extolled, has for many ages ceased to be observed.¹ Yet the institution of *Benedict* changed the state of monastic life in the West, in various respects; not the least important of which was that, by *profession* and *petition*,² he bound the monks for ever to observe his rule; whereas, previously, they changed the laws and regulations of their founders at pleasure.³

¹ [The modern Benedictines are themselves obliged to admit, that the Rule of their founder is no longer fully obeyed. But they resort to a convenient distinction. The Rule, say they, has its *essential*, and its *accidental* parts. That the monks should labour, earn their own bread, and live frugally, belongs to the accidental part. The essential parts are the *vows*, which we observe religiously, a few faults excepted. We admit freely, that the order is richer than in the days of its founder. Father Benedict would be amazed, should he rise out of his grave, and instead of the miserable huts which he erected on mount Cassino, find there a palace, in which kings and princes might reside; and see the abbot transformed into a prince of the empire, with a multitude of subjects, and an income of five or six hundred thousand ducats. *Schl.*—On the present state of this monastery see Stäudlin's *Kirchliche Geographie*, i. 565. *Tr.*]

² [The monastic *profession* (*professio*) is otherwise called *promise*. (Du Cange, in *voc. Promissio*.) It is also sometimes confounded with the *petition*, a term which arose, Du Cange says, 'Quia nempe novitius, exacto novitiatus tempore, *petebat* ab abbate ut ad professionem admitteretur.' (In *voc. Petitio*.) Mabillon (*ubi supra*) thus distinguishes the two. The *promise*, he says, was the vow made to God, the *petition* was an engagement, built upon that vow, which the novice had to sign, and which rendered him amenable to men for the due observance of his vow. This instrument, probably, contained a *petition* for admission into the order. Mabillon's words are, 'Promissio monachum Deo; petitio, veluti contractus et pactum, (sic appellat Fructuosus,) etiam hominibus et religioni obnoxium reddebat.' *S.*]

³ See Mabillon, *Pref. ad sæc. iv. p. 1, Act. SS. Ord. Bened. p. xviii. &c.* [*Benedict* changed the state of monkery, especially, by restraining the instability of the monks, and rendering their vows irrevocable. It was not strange that the order spread far and wide. His *Rule* was better calculated for Europeans than any other; and the first Benedictines were virtuous, upright, and useful people. Wherever they

came, they converted the wilderness into a cultivated country: they pursued the breeding of cattle, and agriculture, laboured with their own hands, drained morasses, and cleared away forests. These monks,—taking the word *Benedictines* in its largest extent, were of great advantage to all Europe, and particularly to Germany. By them Germany was cultivated, and rendered a fruitful country. They preserved for us all the books of antiquity, all the sciences and learning of the ancients. For they were obliged to have libraries in their monasteries; because their rule required them to read a portion of each day. Some individuals were occupied in transcribing the books of the ancients; and hence came the manuscripts, which still exist here and there in the libraries of monasteries. The sciences were cultivated nowhere but in their cloisters. They kept up schools there, for the monks, and for such as were destined to be monks. And without their cloisters, they also had schools, in which the people of the world were instructed. From these monasteries proceeded men of learning, who were employed in courts, as chancellors, vice-chancellors, secretaries, &c., and these again patronised the monasteries. Even the children of sovereign princes were brought up among the Benedictines, and after they came to their thrones, retained attachment and reverence for the order to whom they were indebted for their education. The Benedictines were esteemed *saints*, and their prayers were supposed to be particularly efficacious. All this rendered the order powerful and rich. But as soon as they became rich, they became voluptuous and indolent, and their cloisters were haunts of vice and wickedness. In the seventeenth century, this order began to revert back to its original designs, especially in France; and it performed essential service to the republic of learning, in particular, by publishing beautiful editions of the Fathers. *Schl.*—Among monastic services, those rendered to the arts should not be forgotten. The Benedictine order, especially, overspread Europe with noble and tasteful piles of building. It is, indeed, an order to which civilisation is much indebted. It long furnished a nursery and a citadel for all that is most valuable in man. Un-

§ 7. Only a short time elapsed before this new order of monks was in a most flourishing state in all the western countries. In Gaul it was propagated by *St. Maurus*; in Sicily and Sardinia, by *Placidus* and others; in England, by *Augustine* and *Mellitus*; in Italy and in other parts, by *Gregory* the Great, who is reported to have lived some time in this order.¹ In Germany, *Boniface* afterwards caused it to be received.² This rapid progress of their order the Benedictines ascribe to the miracles of *St. Benedict* and his disciples, and to the holiness and superiority of the rules which he prescribed. But those who more critically examine the causes of events, have very nearly all united in the opinion, that the favour shown it by the Roman pontiffs, to whose glory and exaltation this whole order was especially devoted, contributed more than all other causes to its wide extension and grandeur. It was not, however, till the ninth century, that all other rules and societies became extinct, and the Benedictines reigned alone.³

§ 8. Among the Greek and Oriental Christians, the most distinguished writers of this century were the following. *Procopius* of Gaza expounded some books of the Bible, not unhappily.⁴ *John Maxentius*, a monk of Antioch, besides some books against the sects

doubtedly, it was, even when most serviceable, a stronghold of idleness and imposture; but it answered ends of great importance, at a time when nothing peaceful could be secure without a protecting mantle of superstition. S.]

¹ See Jo. Mabillon, *Diss. de Vita Monastica Gregorii Magni*; to Hadr. Valesius, *Analect. Veter.* t. ii.; and Mabillon's *Pref. ad Sæcul.* i. [*Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* p. xxix. &c. Yet some deny this, as Anton. Gallonius; [*de Monachatu Gregorii*, &c.] on whose book, see Rich. Simon, *Lettres Choisies*, iii. 63. [Yet the monkery of Gregory the Great, after the investigations of Mabillon, seems no longer liable to doubt. He established six monasteries in Sicily, and assigned them, out of his great riches, as much landed estate as was necessary for their support. A seventh monastery he founded at Rome, in his own house dedicated to St. Andrew; which still exists, and is in the hands of the Camaldulensians. See Fleury, *Histoire Ecclès.* liv. xxxiv. § 34. *Schl.*]

² Anton. Dandini Altessera, *Origines Rei Monasticae*, lib. i. cap. 9, p. 33. On the propagation of the Benedictine Rule in the various countries of Europe, Jo. Mabillon has a particular treatise, *Pref. ad Sæcul.* i. [*Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.*] and *Pref. ad Sæcul.* iv. pt. i. [*Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* t. v.] p. lxii. &c. [St. Maurus, whose name a distinguished congregation still bears, was one of the most famous disciples of Benedict. Placidus was an historian of this order.

Of Augustine, notice has already been taken. Mellitus preached to the East Saxons, and was afterwards archbishop of Canterbury.—The great and rapid dissemination of this order was wonderful. Many particular and new orders, distinguished from each other by their dress, their caps, and forms of government, originated from it. The Carthusians, Cistercians, Cœlestines, Grandmontensians, Præmonstratensians, Cluniacensians, Camaldulensians, &c., were only branches growing out of this principal stock. The most respectable and renowned men were trained up in it. Volaterranus enumerates 200 cardinals, 1,600 archbishops, 4,000 bishops, and 15,700 abbots and men of learning, who belonged to this order. *V. Einem.*]

³ Ja. l'Enfant, *Histoire du Concile de Constance*, ii. 32, 33.

⁴ See Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiastique de M. du Pin*, i. 197. [Procopius, a teacher of eloquence at Gaza, in the reign of Justinian, A.D. 520, &c., has left us several Commentaries on the Scriptures, which are chiefly compilations from earlier writers: viz. on the Octateuch (extant only in Latin); on the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, Greek and Latin, Lugd. Bat. 1620, 4to; on Isaiah, Greek and Latin, Paris, 1580; on Proverbs [published by Ang. Mai, *Classici Auctores*, ix. 1—256. *Ed.*] and the twelve Minor Prophets; never published. Also many neat Epistles, published by Aldus. *Tr.*]

of his times, wrote *Scholia on Dionysius the Areopagite*.¹ *Agapetus* procured himself a place among the wise men of this age, by his *Scheda Regia*, addressed to the emperor *Justinian*.² *Eulogius*, a presbyter of Antioch, was ardent and energetic in opposing the heresies of his times.³ *John*, bishop of Constantinople, called the *Faster*, on account of the austerity of his life, distinguished himself by some small treatises, and particularly by his *Pœnitential*.⁴ *Leontius* of Byzantium has left us a book *against the heretics*, and some other writings.⁵ *Evagrius Scholasticus* has left an *Ecclesiastical History*, but it is disfigured by fables.⁶ *Anastasius*, of Sinai, is generally supposed to be the author of a well-known yet futile book, entitled *Hodegus contra Acephalos*.⁷

¹ [John Maxentius was a Scythian monk, and a presbyter of Antioch, who flourished about 520. Several of his epistles and tracts, defending [the doctrine, that one of the Trinity was crucified, and opposing the Pelagian errors, are extant in Latin, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, t. ix. His *Scholia* on *Dionysius the Areopagite* are published, Greek and Latin, with that author. *Tr.*]

² [Agapetus, a deacon in the great church at Constantinople, in 527, composed his *Instructions* for a prince, addressed to Justinian, then recently invested with the purple. The book contains seventy-two heads of advice, displaying good common sense, but not profound. It has been often published; as, Venice, 1509, 8vo.; and with a commentary, Franeker, 1608, 8vo. *Francf.* 1659, 4to. *Lips.* 1669, 8vo. *Tr.*]

³ [Eulogius of Antioch was made bishop of Alexandria about 581. A homily of his is extant, Greek and Latin, in *Combesis, Auctuar.* *Nov.* t. i.; and large extracts from his six books against Novatus, his two books against Timotheus and Severus, his book against Theodosius and Severus, and another against the compromise between the Theodosians and the Gaianites, are in Photius, *Biblioth. Codd.* 182, 208, 225—227. *Tr.*]

⁴ [John the Faster was a native of Capadocia, and bishop of Constantinople from 585 to 596. The title of *universal bishop* given him in the council of 587, involved him in trouble with Pelagius II. and Gregory I., bishops of Rome. Two of his homilies are extant, Greek and Latin, among those of Chrysostom; and his *Pœnitential*, (or rules for treating penitents,) and a discourse on confessions and penitence, are published, Greek and Latin, by Morin, *de Pœnitentia*, Appendix, p. 77, 92. *Tr.*—Oudin maintains that this *Pœnitential* is far posterior to the *Faster's* time, i. 1476. *S.*]

⁵ [Leontius of Byzantium was first an advocate, and then a monk in a monastery in Palestine, and flourished A.D. 590 and onwards. Cyril (in his life of St. Sabas,

cap. 72,) says he was accused of Origenism. Vossius (*de Hist. Gr.* lib. iv. c. 8,) thinks he was the same as Leontius bishop of Cyprus. He wrote *de Sectis Liber*, Greek and Latin, in *Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr.* Paris, 1624, t. i. p. 493; likewise, *adv. Eutychianos et Nestorianos*, lib. iii. *adv. Fraudes Apollinaristar.* lib. ii. *Solutiones Argumentorum Severi: Dubitationes et Definitiones contra eos qui negant in Christo duas naturas*; extant, in Latin, *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. ix.; also an Oration on the man blind from his birth, Greek and Latin, in *Combesis, Auctuar.* *Nov.* t. i.; and some other tracts never published. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Evagrius Scholasticus was born at Epiphania, in Syria, A.D. 536. At four years of age he was sent to school; after grammar he studied rhetoric, and became an advocate at Antioch. He was much esteemed, and especially by Gregory, bishop of Antioch, whom he often assisted in difficult cases. The emperor Tiberius made him a quæstor, and Maurice, an honorary præfect. His only work that has reached us, is his *Ecclesiastical History*, in six books. It is a continuation of the histories of Socrates and Sozomen, from the council of Ephesus, in 431, to 594. Its chief fault is, that of the age, credulity, and an over-estimation of monkish legends. It was published, Greek and Latin, by Valesius, among the other Greek ecclesiastical historians, and has been translated into English, Cambridge, 1683, fol. *Tr.*]

⁷ See Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclès. de M. du Pin*, i. 232; and Barat, *Bibliothèque Choisie*, ii. 21, &c. [There were three persons, called Anastasius Sinaita. The first, after being a monk in the monastery on Mount Sinai, was made patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 561; but was banished in the year 570, for opposing the edict of Justinian respecting the incorruptibility of Christ's body. He was restored in 592, and died in 599. He was a learned and orthodox man, and a considerable

§ 9. Among the Latin writers, the most distinguished were the following. *Gregory the Great*, Roman pontiff, a man of good and

writer.—The *second* of this name was the immediate successor of the first in the see of Antioch, from 599 to 609, when he was murdered by the Jews. He translated the work of Gregory the Great, on the Pastoral Office, from Latin into Greek; but the translation is lost.—The *third* Anastasius flourished about A.D. 685. He was a mere monk of mount Sinai. He wrote a compendious account of heresies, and of the councils that condemned them, from the earliest times to the year 680; which still exists in MS.—The *Ὁδηγός* or *Guide to shun the Acephali*, is a rhapsody, without method and without merit. It has been ascribed to the *third* Anastasius; because it contains several allusions to events posterior to the times of the first two of this name. Yet, as it relates to controversies in which the *first* Anastasius is known to have been much engaged, some have supposed it was originally composed by him, or from his writings, with subsequent additions or interpolations. It was printed, Greek and Latin, by Gretser, Ingolst. 1604, 4to.—The *154 Questions and Answers*, respecting biblical subjects, ascribed to the *first* Anastasius, and published, Greek and Latin, by Gretser, 1617, 4to, also bear marks of a later age. Cave supposes they were compiled from the works of the *first* Anastasius. His eleven books of *Contemplations on the Hexaëmeron*, were published in Latin, Paris, 1609. Dr. Alix published the twelfth book, Greek and Latin, Lond. 1682, 4to.—His five *doctrinal Discourses*, (on the Trinity, Incarnation, &c.) together with all the works just enumerated, are extant, in Latin, *Biblioth. Patr.* t. ix. Six of his *Homilies* are extant, Greek and Latin, in Combefis, *Auctuar. Nov.* 1648, t. i. Another tract of his, on the three Quadragesimæ, is extant, Greek and Latin, in Cotelier, *Monum. Eccl. Gr.* t. iii. Various other tracts of his exist only in MS., and a considerable number of others are lost. [His *Lucubratiunculæ* were published by Ang. Mai, *Ser. Vet. Nova Collectio*, t. i. p. i. p. 369. Rome, 1825. On the *Acephali*, see cent. v. p. ii. c. 5, § 20. *Ed.*]

[The following is a catalogue of the Greek and oriental writers of this century, omitted by Mosheim.

Olympiodorus, a deacon at Alexandria, who probably flourished at the commencement of this century. He wrote several *commentaries* on the Scriptures. His short *Comment on Ecclesiastes* is extant, Greek and Latin, in Fronto Duceus, *Auctuar.* t. ii. His *Comment on Lamentations*, Lat. Rome, 1598, 4to, and his *Commentary on Job*, is

preserved almost entire, in the *Catena on Job*, published, Greek and Latin, by Patr. Junius, Lond. 1637, fol.

Julian, bishop of Halicarnassus in Caria, a Eutychian, who flourished under Anastasius, A.D. 510, and was active in the contests of his times. On the accession of Justin, A.D. 518, he fled to Alexandria, where he advanced the idea that Christ's body was always *incapable of corruption*, and produced a division and a party among the Monophysites. He wrote a *Commentary on Job*, which is often quoted in the *Catena on Job*, published Lond. 1637, fol.

Timotheus, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 511—517, distinguished for his hatred of his predecessor Macedonius. He wrote a book on the various heresies, which is extant, Gr. and Lat. in Combefis, *Auctuar. Nov.* t. ii. and more perfect, in Cotelier, *Monum. Eccl. Gr.* iii. 377.

Severus, a leading man among the Acephali or Monophysites, was in his youth a pagan, and studied in the law school at Berytus; afterwards he became a monk at Gaza, and embracing and propagating Eutychian principles, was expelled the monastery. He repaired to Constantinople, and insinuated himself into the graces of the emperor Anastasius, who favoured the Eutychians. In 513, on the expulsion of the orthodox Flavian, he was made Patriarch of Antioch, subscribed the Henoticon of Zeno, and condemned the council of Chalcedon. Some bishops withdrew from his communion: but, aided by Jews, he violently persecuted the orthodox, and especially the monks of Palestine, of whom he slew 350, and left their bodies to be consumed by beasts of prey. On the death of Anastasius, and accession of Justin, in 518, he was proscribed, and fled to Egypt, where he lived many years. Here he became involved with Timothy, patriarch of Alexandria, and Gaianus his deacon, by asserting that the body of Christ, previously to its resurrection, was corruptible. He now went to Constantinople, and persuaded Anthimus the patriarch to embrace Eutychian principles; and was producing great commotions, when two councils condemned him and Anthimus, A.D. 536. His subsequent history is little known. He was a man of talents, ambitious, restless, little careful to maintain consistency in conduct or belief, a great writer, and possessed of vast influence among the Eutychians. He wrote an immense number of epistles, many homilies and tracts, and extensive *Commentaries* on Scripture; none of which are published entire, his works having been

upright intentions, for the most part, but very simple, superstitious,

proscribed and ordered to be all burned, by authority of the emperor. Yet numerous extracts are preserved; and some whole treatises are supposed to exist still in the East. The *Ritual* for baptism and public worship in the Syrian church, which is extant, Syr. and Lat. Antw. 1572, 4to, has been attributed to him. His Commentaries are often quoted in the *Catena Patrum*. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 499, &c. [Fragments of Severus are collected by Ang. Mai, in the *Nova Collectio*, t. ix. and *Classici Scriptores*, t. x. in *Spicileg. Rom.* (1840) iii. 722, x. 169. Gieseler, ii. 95. *Ed.*]

John, of Cappadocia, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 517—520. He condemned Severus of Antioch in 518; and the next year, by order of the emperor Justin, became reconciled with the Roman pontiffs. Five of his Epistles are extant in the *Concilia*, t. iv. and v.

Theodorus Lector flourished at Constantinople, A.D. 518. He compiled an Eccles. History from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, in two books; to which he annexed a Continuation, in two additional books. Large extracts from the Continuation, by Nicephorus Callistus, are preserved, and published, Gr. and Lat., among the Gr. Eccl. Historians, by Valesius.

Timotheus III., patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 519—535, a warm Eutychian, and protector of Severus and Julian, till he fell out with them respecting the corruptibility of Christ's body. He wrote numerous sermons and theological tracts, large extracts from which are preserved by Cosmas Indicopleustes.

Epiphanius, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 520—535. He confirmed the reconciliation between the sees of Rome and Constantinople, made by John his predecessor, and approved the council of Chalcedon. Five of his Epistles to Hormisdas, bishop of Rome, are extant, in the *Concilia*, t. iv.

Ephraim, patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 525—546. He was a native of Syria, a civil magistrate, and count of the East, when made bishop. He wrote *pro Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, et Synodo Chalcedonensi, libri* iii.; which are lost, except copious extracts from the two first books, in Photius, *Biblioth.* Cod. 228, 229. [There is a fragment in Mai, *Class. Auct.* x. 558. *Ed.*]

Simeon, Stylites junior. In his childhood he mounted his pillar, near Antioch, which he occupied 68 years, A.D. 527—596. He is often mentioned by Evagrius, who knew him well. His fifth epistle to the emperor Justinian is extant, Gr. and Lat., in the transactions of the second Nicene

council, *Actio V. Concilia*, t. vii. Some other tracts of his exist in MS. in the Vatican library.

Zacharias Scholasticus, archbishop of Mytilene. He was first a lawyer at Berytus, then a bishop, and flourished A.D. 536. While at Berytus, he wrote a Dissertation, or dialogue, against the philosophers who maintain that the world is eternal; extant, Gr. and Lat. Lips. 1654, 4to, and in Fr. Ducaeus, *Auctuar.* t. i. He also wrote a disputation against the two first principles of all things, held by the Manichæans; extant, Lat. in Henr. Canis, *Antiquæ Lectio.* t. v. and both works, in *Biblioth. Patrum*, t. ix.

Nonnosus, Justinian's ambassador to the Saracens, the Auxumites, and the Homerites, about 540. He wrote a history of his travels; from which Photius has preserved extracts, *Biblioth.* Cod. 3.

Isaac, bishop of Nineveh, who turned monk and travelled as far as Italy. He flourished about the year 540, and wrote 87 ascetic discourses, which still exist in MS. A bad Latin translation of 53 of them, much garbled, was published in the *Biblioth. Magn. Patr.* t. xi.

Arethas, archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, is supposed to have lived about 540. He compiled from Andreas Cæsariensis, an *Exposition of the Apocalypse*; extant, Gr. and Lat., annexed to *Ecumenius*, Paris, 1631.

Gregentius, archbishop of Taphar, the metropolis of the Homerites in Arabia Felix, flourished A.D. 540, and died 552. An account of his dispute with Herbanus, a learned Jew, is extant, Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1586, 8vo, and in Fr. Ducaeus, *Auctuar.* t. i. He also compiled a code of civil laws, for the Homerites, by order of Abram their king, which still exists in MS.

Barsanuphius, an anchorite of Gaza, in the middle of this century, composed a large amount of ascetic writings, which still exist; but are not thought worth publishing. [His *Doctrina*, in Galland's *Bibl. Patr.* xi. 592. *Ed.*]

Eutychius, a monk, and bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 553—565. In 564 he was deprived of his see and banished, by Justinian, for not admitting the incorruptibility of Christ's body, while He was on earth; but he was restored in 578, and died in 585, aged 73. One epistle of his, to pope Vigilius, is extant among the Acts of the fifth general council, A.D. 553, *Concil.* v. 425. [Fragments are in Mai, *Nova Coll.* ix. and *Classici Scr.* x. *Ed.*]

Cyril, a monk of Palestine, who flourished

and opposed to all learning, as his *Epistles* and *Dialogues* show.¹

A.D. 557. He composed the lives of several monks, as of St. John the Silentiary, of St. Euthymius, and of St. Sabas, all of which are still extant.

Paul Cyrus Florus, a poet who flourished about A.D. 555. His poetic description of the church of St. Sophia, at Constantinople, built by Justinian, is still extant, Gr. and Lat., by Charles du Fresne, Paris, 1670, subjoined to the history of Cinnamus.

John, surnamed Climacus from his book, and Sinaita from his residence, also Scholasticus, a monk of mount Sinai, who flourished about 564. He wrote *Scala Paradisi*, in 30 chapters, each marking a grade of virtue; also *Liber ad Pastorem*: both published, Gr. and Lat., by Matth. Rader, Paris, 1633, fol.

John Scholasticus, a presbyter at Antioch, deputy to Constantinople, and bishop there A.D. 564—578. He wrote *Collectio Canonum*, in 50 titles, and including the 85 Canons of the Apostles; also *Nomocanon*; which, besides a collection of canons, contained an epitome of the civil laws concerning ecclesiastical affairs; likewise *Capita Ecclesiastica*. All these tracts were published, Gr. and Lat., in Justell's *Biblioth. Juris Canon.* ii. 499, 603, 660, ed. Paris, 1662.

Theodorus, bishop of Iconium, about A.D. 564, wrote the martyrdom of Julitta and her son Quiricus, only three years old, in the persecution of Diocletian, published, Gr. and Lat., by Combefis, *Acta Martyr. Antiq.* Paris, 1660, 8vo, p. 231.

Eustratius, a presbyter of the great church of Constantinople, under Eutychius, the patriarch, about A.D. 578. He wrote a book in confutation of those who say, the soul is inactive when separated from the body; published Gr. and Lat. by Leo Allatius, in his historical work concerning purgatory, Rome, 1655, 8vo. p. 319—581. He also wrote the *Life of Eutychius* the patriarch; published Gr. and Lat. by Surius, and by Papebroch.

Theophanes, of Byzantium, flourished A.D. 580, and wrote a history of the wars of the Romans with the Persians, A.D. 567—573 in ten books; and some other parts of the history of his own times. Only extracts remain.

John Maro, a very prominent man among the Maronites, who flourished about A.D. 580. He wrote Commentaries on the Liturgy of St. James, which are still extant in Syriac, and have been much quoted by Abr. Echellensis, Morin, Nairon, and others.

Leontius, bishop of Neapolis or Hagio-polis in Cyprus, who flourished about 600,

and died about 620 or 630. He wrote an Apology for the Christians, against the Jews; of which a large part is preserved in the fourth Act of the second Nicene council; *Conc.* vii. 236. He also wrote some homilies, and biographies of saints. But it is not easy to distinguish his writings from those of Leontius of Byzantium. *Tr.*]

¹ His works were published by the French Benedictine, Denys de St. Marthe, in four splendid volumes, fol. Paris, 1705. For an account of him, see the *Acta Sanctor.* Martii, ii. 121, &c. [Gregory the Great, of senatorian rank, was born at Rome, about A.D. 540. After a good education, being a youth of great promise, he was early admitted to the senate, and made governor of the city before he was thirty years old. The death of his father put him in possession of a vast estate; which he devoted wholly to pious and charitable uses. Renouncing public life, he became a monk, built and endowed six monasteries in Sicily, and a seventh at Rome, in which he himself lived under the control of the abbot. In 579, he was drawn from his monastery, ordained a deacon, and sent as papal legate to the court of Constantinople, where he resided five years, and became very popular. Returning in 584, with a rich treasure of relics, he retired to his monastery, and his favourite mode of life. In 590, he was raised to the papal chair, much against his will; and for thirteen years and a half, was an indefatigable bishop, a zealous reformer of the clergy and the monasteries, and a strenuous defender of the prerogatives of his see. He failed in his attempt to coerce the Illyrian bishops to condemn the *three chapters*; but succeeded in disturbing the harmony between the Orthodox and the Donatists in Africa. He discouraged all coercive measures for the conversion of the Jews; endeavoured to confine the monks to their monasteries, and to a more religious life; and attempted to eradicate the prevailing vices of the clergy, simony and debauchery. He was instrumental in converting the Arian Lombards to the orthodox faith, and in restraining the ravages of that warlike people. He interfered in the discipline of foreign churches, remonstrated against an imperial law forbidding soldiers to become monks; laboured to effect a peace between the Lombards and the emperors; and attended to every interest of the church and the people under him. Yet he claimed no civil authority; but always treated the emperors as his lords and masters. In 595, he commenced his long contest with the patriarchs of Constantinople, who had assumed the honorary

Cæsarius, of Arles, composed some tracts on moral subjects, and a *Rule for holy virgins*.¹ *Fulgentius*, of Ruspe in Africa, contended valiantly in numerous books, against the Pelagians and the Arians;²

title of *universal bishops*. This title, Gregory maintained to be blasphemous, anti-christian, and diabolical, by whomsoever assumed. But he could not induce any of the orientals to join with him. In 596, he sent Augustine and other monks to convert the Anglo-Saxons, which they accomplished. In 601, he defended the use of images in churches; allowed the Saxons to retain some of their pagan customs, and endeavoured to extend the power of Augustine over the ancient British churches. In the same year when Phocas, the usurper, murdered all the imperial family, and clothed himself with the purple, Gregory obsequiously flattered him, and submitted to his usurpation. At length worn out with cares and disease, he died in March A.D. 604, having reigned thirteen years and a half. Gregory was exceedingly active, self-denying, submissive to his superiors, and courteous, sympathetic, and benevolent to all; he was an enthusiast for monkery and for the honour of his see. His writings are more voluminous than those of any other Roman pontiff. His letters amount to 840; besides which, he wrote 35 books on Job, called *Gregory's Morals*; a *Pastoral*, a treatise on the duties of a pastor, in 4 books; 22 Homilies on *Ezekiel*; 40 Homilies on the *Gospels*; 4 books of Dialogues. To him are ascribed also an Exposition of the first book of Samuel, in six books; an Exposition of the seven penitential Psalms; and an Exposition of the Canticles. His best works are his *Pastoral* and his *Morals*. His *Dialogue* is stuffed with monkish tales; and the Exposition of the penitential Psalms breathes the spirit of later times, and has been ascribed to Gregory VII. The best edition is said to be that of St. Marthe; but that of de Sousainville, Paris, 1675, 3 vols. fol. is esteemed; the latest edition is that of Joh. Bapt. Galliccioli, Venice, 1768—76, in 17 vols. 4to.—His life by Paulus Diaconus, of the ninth century; and another by John, deacon at Rome, about 880, in four books, are in Mabillon's *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* i. 378—484. Among the moderns, besides Du Pin, Bayle, and Oudin, we have Maimbourg's *Histoire du Pontificat. de S. Grégoire le Grand*, Paris, 1686, 4to; Denys de St. Marthe, *Histoire de S. Grég. le Gr.* Rouen, 1698, 4to, and in the *Opp. Greg. M.* iv. 199—305. See also Bower, *Lives of the Popes* (Gregory I.), ii. 463—543, and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xvii. 243—371. Tr.]

¹ The Benedictines have recently given a learned account of Cæsarius in their *Hist.*

Litt. de la France, iii. 190. [His life written by his pupils, Cyprian, Messian, and Stephen, in two books, is extant in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Benedict.* i. 636—654. He was born in Gaul, A.D. 469. While a boy, he ran away, and entered the monastery of Lerins, where he lived many years, and became the cellarer. His health failing, he retired to Arles; of which place he was made bishop in 502. In 506, he was falsely accused of treason, and banished by Alarie, king of the Visigoths, to Bourdeaux, but soon recalled. In 508, Theodoric king of the Goths, summoned him to Ravenna to answer a similar charge. Being acquitted, he visited Italy and returned to Arles. He presided at the council of Arles in 524; and at that of Valence in 529, he triumphantly maintained the principle, that a man cannot obtain salvation without *preventing* grace. He died A.D. 542, aged 73. He was zealous for monkery, and a strenuous advocate for the doctrines of Augustine, respecting free grace and predestination. He has left us 46 Homilies, a Rule for monks, another for nuns, a treatise on the ten virgins, an exhortation to charity, an Epistle, and his Will. He also wrote two books on Grace and Free Will, against Faustus, which are lost. His works are printed in the *Biblioth. Patr.* vol. viii. and vol. xxvii. See Cave, *Hist. Littér.* i. 492. Tr.]

² See, concerning Fulgentius, the *Acta Sanctor. Januarii*, i. 32, &c. [He was born at Carthage, about 468. His father, who was a senator, died while he was young; but his mother gave him an excellent education. While a boy, he had all Homer by rote, and could talk Greek fluently. He was early made procurator of the city, but soon weary of public life, he retired to a monastery, became a monk and an abbot, changed his monastery, endured persecution from the Arians, went to Syracuse, and thence to Rome in 500; returned to Africa again, was elected bishop of Ruspe in 507, was banished to Sardinia by Thrasimund the Arian king of the Vandals, recalled by Hilderic, the succeeding king, and ruled his church till his death in 533. He was one of the most learned, pious, and influential bishops of his age. He wrote three books *ad Monimum*, (on predestination and kindred doctrines;) one book against the Arians; three books *ad Thrasimundum Regem*, (on the person and offices of Christ;) ten sermons on divers subjects; *de Fide Orthodoxa*, *Liber ad Donatum*; *de Fide Liber ad Petr. Diacon.*; eleven Epistles; *de Trinitate Liber* on Predestination and Grace, three

but his diction is harsh and uncouth, like that of most Africans. *Ennodius*, of Pavia, was not contemptible among the writers of this age, either for prose or poetry; but he was an infatuated adulator of the Roman pontiff, who, he taught, as never had been taught before, could be called in question by no one of mortals.¹ *Benedict* of Nursia, whose name is immortalised by his *Rule* for a monastic life, and the numerous families of monks who have followed it.² *Dionysius*, surnamed *Exiguus* on account of his lowliness of mind, has deserved well of his own age and of posterity, by his *collection of ancient canons*, and his chronological researches.³ *Fulgentius Ferrandus*, an African, procured himself reputation by some small treatises, especially by his *Abridgment of the canons*; but his diction has no charms.⁴ *Facundus*, of Hermiane, was a strenuous defender of the *three chapters*, of which an account will be given hereafter.⁵ *Arator* versified the *Acts of the Apostles*, in Latin, not badly.⁶ *Primasius*,

books; and various other Tracts and Homilies: all of which were published, Paris, 1684, 4to. Among his lost works, were seven books on Grace and Free Will, addressed to Faustus; and ten books on Predestination and Grace, against Fabian. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 493. Tr.]

¹ See the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 96, &c. [Ennodius was born A.D. 473, of a pro-consular family. He married young; was afterwards deacon at Pavia, and subsequently at Rome; was twice papal legate to the emperor at Constantinople, was made bishop of Pavia in 511, and died in 521. He wrote nine books of *Epistles*, or 297 in number; unpublished, and of little use to the history of his times; a *Panegyric* on Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths; an *Apology* for the synod of Rome A.D. 503; the life of Epiphanius, his predecessor at Pavia; life of Antony, a monk of Lerins; two books of poems or epigrams; and various other little pieces: all of which were published by Ja. Sirmond, Paris, 1611, 8vo.; and in the Works of Sirmond, vol. i. Paris, 1696; also in the *Biblioth. Patr.* ix. Tr.]

² [See above, cent. vi. p. ii. c. 2, § 6, and note. He has left us nothing in writing, except his monastic regulations, two *Epistles*, and two discourses; which are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* ix. 640, &c. Tr.]

³ [A monk of Scythian extraction, who flourished at Rome, A.D. 533, and died before 556. He was intimate with Cassiodorus; who gives him a high character for intelligence and virtue. Being familiar with Greek, he collected and translated a body of canons, including the first fifty Apostolic Canons, and those of the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Chalcedon, Sardica, and some in Africa; he also made a collection of the decrees of the Roman pontiffs from Siricius to Anastasius II.; both are extant in Justell's *Biblioth. Juris Canonici*,

t. i. He likewise translated a synodic epistle of Cyril of Alexandria; a paschal epistle of Proterius; the life of St. Pachomius; an Oration of Proclus; Gregory Nyssen *de Opificio Hominis*; and a history of the discovery of the head of John the Baptist; and composed a Paschal Cycle of ninety-seven years, commencing A.D. 527, of which only a fragment remains. In the last work he proposed, that Christians should use the *time of Christ's birth* as their *era*; which proposal was soon followed universally. Hence the Christian era is called the *Dionysian era*. But Dionysius miscalculated the time of Christ's birth, placing it four years (as most writers suppose) too late. Tr.]

⁴ [Fulgentius Ferrandus was a pupil of Fulgentius Ruspensis, and a deacon at Carthage. He flourished A.D. 533 and onwards. His abridgment of the canons is a short digest of ecclesiastical law, reduced to 232 heads; it is in Justell's *Biblioth. Juris Canon.* t. i. He also wrote the *Life of Fulgentius of Ruspe*, and seven doctrinal *Epistles*. All his works were published by Chifflet, Dijon, 1649, 4to, and then in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. ix. Tr.]

⁵ [Facundus was bishop of Hermiane in Africa, but spent many years at Constantinople, as a representative of the African churches at the imperial court. Here in 546 and 547, he composed his twelve books *pro Defensione trium Capitulorum*, which he presented to Justinian. He also wrote a book against Mutianus Scholasticus, who had inveighed against the African churches for refusing communion with Vigilius. These, with an *Epistle in defence of the three chapters*, were published by Ja. Sirmond, Paris, 1629, 8vo, and annexed to Optatus of Milevis, Paris, 1675, fol. and thence in the *Biblioth. Patr.* x. 1. 109. Tr.]

⁶ [Arator was first an advocate, then one

of Adrumetum, wrote *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul*, and a book on heresies; which are yet extant.¹ *Liberatus*, by his *Breviarium*, or concise history of the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, merits a respectable place among the writers of these times.² *Fortunatus* possessed a happy vein for poetry, which he employed on various subjects, so that he is read with pleasure at the present day.³ *Gregory* of Tours, the father of French history, would have been in higher esteem with the moderns if his *Annals of the Franks*, and his other writings, did not exhibit so many marks of weakness and credulity.⁴ *Gildas*, of Britain, is not to be passed over, because he is the most ancient of the British writers, and because his little book on

of the court of king Athalaric, and finally a subdeacon at Rome. He flourished from 527 to 544; in which latter year he presented his poetic version of the Acts, in two books, to Pope Vigilius. He was much esteemed and honoured by both Athalaric and Vigilius. The poem was first published, with a commentary, at Salamanca, 1516, and afterwards in the *Biblioth. Patr.* x. 125. Tr.]

¹ [Primasius, bishop of Adrumetum or Justinianopolis in Africa, was a delegate to the court of Constantinople, A.D. 550 and 553, and defended the three chapters. His *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul* was compiled from Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and others. He likewise composed a *Mystical Exposition of the Apocalypse*, in five books. Both are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. x. He moreover wrote de *Heresibus*, libri iii.; which are lost, unless they are those published in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. xxvii. the author of which has been so much disputed. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 525, &c. Tr.]

² [Liberatus was archdeacon of the church of Carthage. He was sent twice as a legate to Rome, in 534 and 535. His *Breviarium* is esteemed very authentic and correct, though not elegant. It contains the history of that controversy for 125 years, or to about A.D. 553; and was the result of great research and labour. It was published by Garnier, Paris, 1675, 8vo, and is in most of the Collections of Councils. Tr.]

³ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 464. [Venantius Honorius Clementianus Fortunatus was born in Italy, and educated at Ravenna. About the middle of the century, having been cured of a disease of the eyes by St. Martin of Tours, he determined to visit the tomb of that saint. From Tours he went to Poitiers, where he lived to the end of the century; wrote much, became a presbyter, and at last bishop of Poitiers. His poetic works are two books of short poems, dedicated to Gregory of Tours, four books on the life of St. Martin; and several other short poems. They are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. x. and were published by Brower, Mogunt, 1603, and 1616, 4to. His prose

writings are, short Explanations of the Lord's Prayer, and of the Apostles' Creed; and the lives of eight or ten Gallic saints; viz. St. Albinus, bishop of Angers; St. Germanus, bishop of Paris; St. Radegund, a queen; St. Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers; St. Marcellus, bishop of Paris; St. Aman-tius, bishop of Rodez; St. Remigius, bishop of Rheims; and St. Paternus, bishop of Avranches. The two following are doubtful; St. Mauritius, bishop of Angers; and St. Medard, bishop of Noyon. All these are extant either in Surius, or Mabil-lon's collections. Tr.]

⁴ A particular account is given of him in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 372. For an account of his faults, see Fran. Pagi, *Diss. de Dionysio*, Paris, § xxv. p. 16, annexed to his *Breviar. Pontif. Romanor.* t. iv. But many of his defects are extenuated by Jo. Launoy, *Opp.* t. i. pt. ii. p. 131, &c. [Georgius Florentius Gregorius was born of noble parentage, in Auvergne, A.D. 544. After an education under Gallus, bishop of Clermont, he went to Tours in 556, became deacon in 569, and bishop in 573, and died in 595, aged 52. He was much engaged in councils, and in theological disputes, and at the same time a great writer. Orthodox, active, and rather indiscreet, he was frequently involved in difficulties, for he was deficient in judgment and acumen. His great work, *Annales Francorum*, (sometimes called *Chronica*, *Gesta*, *Historia*, and *Historia Ecclesiastica Francorum*,) in ten books, gives a summary history of the world, from the creation, to the establishment of the kingdom of the Franks; and afterwards a detailed history to 591. He also wrote *Miraculorum libri vii.*; containing the miracles of St. Martin in four books; on the glory of Martyrs, two books; and on the glory of Confessors, one book. Besides these, he wrote *de Vitis Patrum*, (monks) *Liber unus*; *de Vita et Morte VII. Dormientium*; and an Epitome of the History of the Franks, composed before he wrote his *Annales*. All his works, collectively, were best edited by Theod. Ruinart.

the destruction of Britain contains many things not unworthy of notice.¹ *Columbanus*, of Ireland, acquired celebrity by his *Rule* for monks, some poems, and uncommon zeal for the erection of monasteries.² *Isidore*, of Seville, composed various grammatical, theological, and historical works; but he seems to have been deficient in judgment.³ The list of Latin authors in this century may be well closed by two very learned men, the illustrious *Boëthius*, a philosopher, orator, poet, and theologian, who was second to no one of his times for elegance and acuteness of genius;⁴ and *M. Aurelius*

Paris, 1699, fol. They are also in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. xi. Tr.]

¹ Concerning Gildas and Columbanus, none have treated more accurately than the Benedictines, in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 279 and 505. [Gildas was surnamed the Wise, and also Badonius, from the battle of Badon (Bath), about the time of his birth, which was A.D. 520. By these epithets he is distinguished from Gildas Albanus, who lived a little earlier. He was well educated, became a monk of Bangor, and is said to have visited and laboured some time in Ireland. On his return he visited the monastery of Llancarvan, lately founded by a nobleman of South Wales; whose example Gildas urged others to imitate. He spent some time in the northern part of Britain; visited France and Italy; and returned and laboured as a faithful preacher. He is supposed to have died at Bangor, A.D. 590; though some place his death twenty years earlier. His only entire work now existing, is his *Epistola de Excidio Britannia, et Castigatione Ordinis Ecclesiastici*; in which he depicts and laments over the almost total ruin of his country, and the profligacy of manners then prevailing. It was published first by Polydore Virgil, in 1525, by Tho. Gale, in his *Scriptores quindecim*, Lond. 1691, fol. t. i. He also wrote several letters, and perhaps some other pieces, of which only extracts remain. See Cave, *Hist. Litter.* i. 538, &c. Tr.—Nothing certain is known of Gildas except from his own book. The above account is quite apocryphal. See Wright, *Biog. Brit. Litt.* i. 115. Ed.—A new edition of Gildas in 8vo, edited by Mr. Stevenson, was published in London for the *Historical Society* in 1838. S.—And another by Petrie in *Monumenta Hist. Brit.* London, 1848. Ed.]

² [For a notice of Columbanus, see above, cent. vi. p. ii. c. 2, § 5, note. Tr.]

³ [Isidorus Hispalensis, or *junior*, was the son of Severian, præfect of Carthage in Spain, and brother of Fulgentius, bishop of Carthage, and of Leander, whom he succeeded A.D. 595, as bishop of Seville. He presided in the council of Seville in 619, and in that of Toledo, A.D. 633, and died

A.D. 636. He has left us a *Chronicon*, from the creation to A.D. 626; *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum, et Suevorum*; *Originum sive Etymologiarum libri xx.*; *de Scripturis Ecclesiasticis* (a continuation of Jerome and Gennadius, embracing thirty-three writers); *de Vita et Morte Sanctorum utriusque Testamenti Liber*; *de Divinis sive ecclesiasticis Officiis, libri ii.*; *de Differentiis sive Proprietate Verborum, libri ii.*; *Synonymorum, sive soliloquiorum, libri ii.*; *de Natura Rerum, sive de mundo, Liber philosophicus*; *Libra proæmiorum ad libros utriusque Testamenti*; *Commentaria in libros historicos Veteris Test.* (a compilation); *Allegiarum quarundam S. Scripturæ liber*; *Contra nequitiam Judæorum, libri ii.*; *Sententiarum, sive de summo bono, libri iii.*; *Regula Monachorum*; *de Conflictu vitiorum et virtutum liber*; *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*; several Epistles and minor treatises. To him is falsely ascribed a collection of councils and decretals. His works were best published, Paris, 1601, fol., and Cologne, 1617, fol. Tr.]

⁴ [Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severinus Boëthius, born of an illustrious family at Rome, about 470, was sent in his childhood to Athens for education, where he spent eighteen years; and then returned to Rome, the most learned man of the age. He was consul in 510 and 522. Soon after his return to Rome, he was made a patrician, and admitted to the senate. When Theodoric, king of the Goths, entered Rome, A.D. 500, Boëthius was appointed by the senate to address him. The king soon after made him one of his council, and master of his palace. After faithfully serving the king and his country for more than twenty years, he was in 523 falsely accused of a treasonable correspondence, condemned on suborned testimony, and sent to Pavia, where he was kept in close confinement a year or more, and then privately put to death by order of the king. Besides more than forty books of translations and commentaries on Aristotle, Porphyry, and Cicero, he wrote two books on arithmetic, five books on music, two books on geometry, and several tracts against the Eutychians, Nestorians, and other errorists. But his most famous work was *de Consola-*

Cassiodorus Senator, who was, indeed, inferior in many respects to the former, yet no contemptible author.¹ Both have left us various productions of their pens.²

tione Philosophiæ, libri v. written while in prison at Pavia. This was translated into Saxon by Alfred the Great, (printed, Oxford, 1698,) and into English by Chaucer, and by queen Elizabeth. It was composed partly in verse and partly in prose; and has the form of a dialogue between Boëthius himself and *Philosophy* personified; who endeavours to console him with considerations, derived not from Christianity, but from the doctrines of Plato, Zeno, and Aristotle. The works of Boëthius were published with notes, Basil, 1570, fol. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 495, &c.; and Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* t. iii. Gervaise, *Histoire de Boèce*, Paris, 1715, 2 vols. 8vo; and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xvi. 99—121. Tr.—A new edition of King Alfred's *Boëthius*, by J. S. Cardale, was printed at London, with an English translation and notes, in 1829. S.]

¹ See Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiastique*, de M. du Pin, i. 211, &c. [*Senator* was part of the name, not the title of Cassiodorus. This eminent statesman and monk was born of honourable parents, at Squillace in the kingdom of Naples, probably before 470. Odoacer in 491, made him *Comes rerum privatarum et sacrarum largitionum*. Two years after, Theodoric became master of Italy, and made him his private secretary; and, subsequently, governor of Calabria; but soon recalled him to court, and made him successively quæstor of the palace, master of the offices, consul, and prætorian prefect. The death of Theodoric in 526 did not deprive Cassiodorus of his high rank; but in 539, being about seventy years old, he retired to a monastery, founded by himself, near his native town in Calabria, where he lived more than twenty years in honourable retirement, devoted to literature and religion. His works are, *Epistolarum* libri xii. (his official letters); *Historiæ Ecclesiæ Tripartitæ* libri xii. (an abridgment from the Latin translations of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, by Epiphanius Scholasticus); *Chronicon ab Adamo usque ad annum 519*; *Computus Paschalis*; *de Robus Gestis Gothorum* libri xii. (which we have, as abridged by Jornandes; the original is supposed still to exist in MS.); *Expositio in Psalmos Davidis*; *Institutiones ad divinas lectiones* libri ii.; *de Orthographia Liberi*; *de VII. Disciplinis Liberi* (on the seven liberal arts); *de Anima Liberi*; *de Oratione*, et *VIII. partibus Orationis*; short Comments on the Acts, the Epistles, and Apocalypse (published separately by bishop Chandler, Lond. 1722, 8vo). Most of the other works are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. xi.

and all of them were well edited by the Benedictines in two vols. fol. Rouen, 1679. See Cave, *Hist. Litterar.* i. 501, and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xvi. 128—154. Tr.]

² [The following are the Latin writers omitted by Mosheim.

Paschasius, deacon of the church of Rome, who took sides with Laurentius, in his contest for the pontificate in 498, and died in 512. He has left us an Epistle to Eugypsius; and two books on the Holy Spirit, against Macedonius; which are in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, t. viii.

Laurentius, bishop of Novara in the north of Italy, flourished about 507. Two of his Homilies on penitence and alms, are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. ix.

Epiphanius Scholasticus, an Italian, who flourished about 510. He translated the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret into Latin; that Cassiodorus might thence make out his *Historia Ecclesiæ Tripartita*, in twelve books. The original translations are lost.

Eugypsius, abbot of a monastery near Naples, about 511. He wrote the life of St. Severinus, the apostle of Noricum; published by Surius.

Hormisdas, pope A.D. 514—523; who made peace, after a long contest, between the oriental and western churches. He has left us eighty Epistles, and some Decretals in the *Concilia*, t. iv. [Jaffé, p. 65. Ed.]

Orentius, or Orientius, bishop of Eliberis in Spain, A.D. 516. See cent. v. p. ii. c. 3, § 7.

Peter, a deacon, who vigorously aided the deputation of oriental monks at Rome, A.D. 520, and wrote *de Incarnatione et Gratia D. N. Jesu Christi, Liber*; extant among the works of Fulgentius, and in *Biblioth. Patr.* t. ix.

Felix IV. pope A.D. 526—530. Three Epistles, in the *Concilia*, t. iv. are ascribed to him; but the two first are spurious. [Jaffé, p. 71. Ed.]

Justinian I. emperor A.D. 527—565. Besides the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, (viz. *Institutionum* lib. iv. *Pandectar. sive Digestorum* lib. l. *Codicis* lib. xii. A.D. 528—535; and *Novellæ*, after A.D. 535,) he issued six Decrees and Epistles relating to ecclesiastical affairs, which are in the *Concilia*, t. v.

Nicetius, of Gallic descent, a monk, abbot, and archbishop of Treves, A.D. 527—568. He was distinguished for piety, and the confidence reposed in him. Two of his tracts, *de Vigilis Servorum Dei*, and *de Bona Psalmodia*, were published by D'Achery,

Spicilegium, t. iii. (ed. nova, t. i. p. 221, 223); and two of his letters (to the emperor Justinian, and to queen Chlosuinda) are in the *Concilia*, t. v.

Justus, bishop of Urgel, in Catalonia, Spain, flourished A.D. 529, and died about 540. His *Commentary on the Canticles* is in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. ix. Two *Epistles* of his are also extant.

Boniface II. Roman pontiff A.D. 530—532, has left us two *Epistles*; in the *Concilia*, t. iv. [Jaffé, p. 72. *Ed.*]

Cogitosus, an Irish monk, nephew of St. Brigit, and supposed to have lived about 530. He wrote *Vita Sanctæ Brigidæ*; which is published by Canisius, Surius, and Bolland.

Montanus, archbishop of Toledo in Spain, during nine years, about 531. He has left us two *Epistles*; extant in the *Concilia*, t. iv.

John II. pope A.D. 532—536. At the request of Justinian, he solemnly sanctioned the orthodoxy of the expression, *One of the Trinity suffered crucifixion*. One spurious and five genuine *Epistles* of his are in the *Concilia*, t. iv. [Jaffé, p. 73. *Ed.*]

Marcellinus, Comes of Illyricum, flourished A.D. 534. His *Chronicon* (from 379, where Jerome's closes, to 534,) has been often published; and is in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. ix.

Agapetus, pope A.D. 535, 536. Seven of his *Epistles* (one of them spurious) are in the *Concilia*, t. iv. and one in t. v. [Jaffé, p. 73. *Ed.*]

Vigilius, pope A.D. 537—555. He obtained his see by intrigue and duplicity; conspired against his predecessor, whom he brought to the grave; and when confirmed in his see, showed himself supremely ambitious, and ready to sacrifice consistency, conscience, the truth itself, to promote his own selfish designs. He issued the most solemn declarations, both for and against the three chapters. In 547 Justinian called him to Constantinople, where he detained him seven years, and compelled him to condemn the three chapters, and himself also, for having repeatedly defended them. We have eighteen *Epistles*, and several of his contradictory *Decretals*, in the *Concilia*, t. v. [Jaffé, p. 76. *Ed.*]

Gordianus, a monk of Messina, carried off by pagan pirates, in 539, when they burned and plundered that monastery. Gordian escaped and returned to Sicily, where he wrote the *Life of Placidus*, the Benedictine abbot of Messina, who with many others was slain in the capture of that monastery. It is extant in Surius, and in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor.* t. i. [Either interpolated or spurious. *Ed.*]

Victor, bishop of Capua, about 545. He translated into Latin Ammonius' Harmony of the four Gospels, falsely ascribed to Tatian; and extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* iii. 265.

Cyprian, a Gaul, and pupil of Cæsarius of Arles. He flourished A.D. 546, and wrote the first book of the *life and achievements of Cæsarius*. Both books are in Surius, and in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor.* t. i.

Mutianus Scholasticus flourished A.D. 550. At the suggestion of Cassiodorus, he translated thirty-four Homilies of Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Hebrews into Latin; printed at Cologne, 1530.

Rusticus, a deacon at Rome, who accompanied pope Vigilius to Constantinople in 547, and showed more firmness than his bishop. His *Dialogus sive disputatio adversus Acephalos*, (in which he inveighs against Vigilius,) is extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. x.

Junilius, an African bishop, who lived about 550, has left us *de Partibus Divinæ Legis libri ii.* in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. x. 339.

Jornandes, or Jordanus, of Gothic extract, bishop of the Goths at Ravenna. His one book *de Rebus Geticis*, or *Historia Gothorum*, from the earliest times to A.D. 540, is an abridgment of the twelve books of Cassiodorus, on the same subject. His *de Regnorum et Temporum successione Liber*, is translated from Florus. Both works are extant in Muratori, *Rerum Italicar. Scriptores*, t. i. 1723.

Engyppius, an African presbyter and abbot, who flourished about 553. He compiled from the works of St. Augustine a collection of sentences on various subjects, in 338 chapters; printed Basil, 1542.

Victor, a bishop in Africa, a resolute defender of the three chapters, in prisons and banishments, from 555—565. He wrote a *Chronicon*, from the creation to 566; but the last 122 years of it are all that remain; published by Scaliger, with the *Chronicon* of Eusebius.

Germanus, (St. Germain,) born at Autun, France, A.D. 496; deacon, 533; presbyter, 536; and bishop of Paris, A.D. 555—576. An epistle of his to queen Brunchild, written A.D. 573, is in the *Concilia*, t. v. His life, written by Venantius Fortunatus, is in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor.* i. 222, &c.

Pelagius I., pope A.D. 555—559. He was papal legate at Constantinople A.D. 535—546; and a strenuous opposer of the three chapters. Sixteen of his epistles are in the *Concilia*, t. v. [Jaffé, p. 82. *Ed.*]

Martin, a monk, born in Pannonia. He travelled in Palestine, preached and became an abbot in Spain, and finally bishop of Braga in Portugal, A.D. 563—583. He has left us *Collectio Canonum*, (extant in *Concilia*, t. v.; and in Justell's *Biblioth. Juris Canon.* t. i.) *Sententiæ Patrum Ægyptiorum*, (in Rosweyd, *de Vitis Patr.*) and *Formula Honestæ Vitæ*, extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* x. 282.

Pelagius II. pope A.D. 579—590. He

had much contention with the Western bishops, who defended the three chapters; and, after 589, with John, bishop of Constantinople, who assumed the title of *universal bishop*. Ten of his Epistles, and six Decrees, are extant, in the *Concilia*, t. v. [Jaffé, p. 89. *Ed.*]

Marius, bishop of Avenches in Switzerland for twenty years, flourished A.D. 581. He has left us a *Chronicon*, continuing that of Prosper, from 455 to 581.

Licinianus, bishop of Carthage in Spain, A.D. 584. He has left us three Epistles; in Aguirre, *Collect. Max. Concil. Hispan.* t. ii.

John, a Spanish Goth, educated at Constantinople, returned to Spain A.D. 584, became an abbot, was persecuted by Leuvigild the Arian king, and died early in the seventh century. He has left a *Chronicon*, from 565 to 590.

Leander, archbishop of Seville in Spain, flourished A.D. 583, and died 595. He was

a monk, an ambassador to Constantinople, and a principal means of the conversion of the Arian Goths of Spain to the catholic faith. A monastic *Rule* is all we have of him; unless he was author of the *Missa Mozarabum*.

Dynamius, collector of the revenues of the Roman church in Gaul. He flourished A.D. 593; and wrote the life of St. Maximus, bishop of Riez; and the life of St. Marius, abbot of Bevon.

Eutropius, a monk, and bishop of Valencia, in Spain, flourished A.D. 599. One of his Epistles is preserved by Lu. Holstenius, *Codex Regular.* Paris, 1663. *Tr.*]

[To these may be added John, Bishop of Ephesus, a Monophysite, the third part of whose Ecclesiastical History, extending from 571—585, was first published in Syriac by Dr. Cureton, in 1853, and in English by R. P. Smith, in 1860, both at Oxford. *Ed.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Continued sinking of theology—§ 2. This exemplified—§ 3. State of exegetical theology—§ 4. Faults of the interpreters—§ 5. Dogmatic theology—§ 6. Practical theology—§ 7. Lives of saints—§ 8. Polemic theology—§ 9. Contests about Origenism—§ 10. About the three chapters—§ 11. The fifth general council—§ 12. Contest about one of the Trinity being crucified.

§ 1. THE barriers of ancient simplicity and truth being once torn up, there was a constant progress for the worse; nor can it easily be said how much of impurity and superstition religion gradually received. The controversialists of the East were continually darkening the great doctrines of revelation, by the most subtle distinctions, and I know not what determinations of the philosophers. Those who instructed the people were only intent upon imbuing them more and more with ignorance, superstition, reverence for the clergy, and admiration of empty ceremonies; so that they lost all sense and knowledge of true piety. Nor is this wonderful, for *the blind*,—that is, persons for the most part ignorant and unreflecting,—*were leaders of the blind*.

§ 2. Whoever wishes to know these things more distinctly, only needs the patience to make himself acquainted with what is read as well in the epistles and other writings of *Gregory the Great*, as elsewhere, respecting the worship of images and saints, the fire to purify souls after death, the efficacy of good works,—that is, of human prescriptions and devices for attaining salvation,—the power of relics to remove defects both of soul and body, and other things of the like character. A man of sense cannot help smiling at the good *Gregory's*

generosity in distributing his relics; but he must feel pity for the simple, stupid people, who could be persuaded that oil taken from lamps burning at the sepulchres of the martyrs, possessed uncommon virtues and utility, and brought great holiness and security to its possessors.¹

§ 3. To give directions for expounding the Holy Scriptures, was the object of *Junilius*, in his two books *on the parts of the divine law*.² The treatise consists of a few questions, neither scientifically arranged nor judiciously considered; for the author was deficient in the learning necessary for his undertaking. *Cassiodorus* likewise laid down some rules for interpretation, in his two books *on the divine laws*. Among the Syrians, *Philoxenus* translated the books of the New Testament and the Psalms of David into Syriac.³ The number of interpreters was considerable. Among the Greeks, the best were *Procopius* of Gaza (rather a pleasing expositor),⁴ *Severus* of Antioch, *Julianus*, and some others. Among the Latins, the more prominent were *Gregory* the Great, *Cassiodorus*, *Primasius*,⁵ *Isidore* of Seville,⁶ *Bellator*,⁷ and a few others.

§ 4. All these, a few only excepted (and particularly the Nestorians in the East, who, following the example of *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, searched for the true sense and meaning of the words), scarcely deserve the name of interpreters. They may be divided into two classes. Some merely collected the opinions and interpretations of the earlier doctors, in works which were afterwards called *Catene* by the Latins.⁸ Such is the *Catena* of *Olympiodorus* on *Job*, that of *Victor* of Capua on the four Gospels, and the Commentary of *Primasius* on the Epistle to the Romans, compiled from Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, and others. Nor is *Procopius* of Gaza to be wholly excluded from this class, although he sometimes followed his own judgment. The others tread in the footsteps of *Origen*, and, neglecting wholly the literal meaning, run after allegories and moral precepts, deducing whatever they wish or desire from the sacred books, by the aid of a roving imagination. Of this class is *Anastasius* of Sinai, whose *Anagogical Contemplations on the Hexaëmeron* expose the ignorance and credulity of the author; likewise *Gregory* the Great, whose *Morals on Job* were formerly extolled undeservedly; also *Isidore* of Seville, in his *Book of allegories on Scripture*; and

¹ See the *List of sacred oils* which *Gregory* the Great sent to queen *Theodelinda*; in *Theod. Ruinart, Acta Martyr. Sincera et Selecta*, p. 619 [and in *Muratori, Anecdota Latina*, ii. 194. *Schl.*]

² See *Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliothèque de M. du Pin*, i. 229.

³ *Jos. Sim. Asseman, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* ii. 83.

⁴ See *Rich. Simon, Lettres choisies*, iv. 120, of the new edition.

⁵ *Rich. Simon, Hist. Crit. des principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Test.* cap. xxiv. p. 337, and *Crit. de la Bibliothèque de M. du*

Pin, i. 226.

⁶ *Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliothèque de M. du Pin*, i. 259.

⁷ [Bellator was a presbyter, a friend of *Cassiodorus*, and flourished A. D. 550. He wrote Commentaries, four books on *Esther*, five on *Tobit*, seven on *Judith*, eight on the *Wisdom of Solomon*, and ten on the *Maccabees*; all of which are now lost. *Tr.*]

⁸ See *Steph. le Moine, Prolegom. ad Varia Sacra*, p. 53, &c., and *Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Biblioth. Græca*, lib. v. cap. 17, or vol. vii. p. 727, &c.

Primasius, in his *Mystic exposition of the Apocalypse*; with many others.

§ 5. An accurate knowledge of religious doctrines, and a simple and lucid exposition of them, no one will expect from the teachers of these times. Most of them reason like blind men about colours, and show themselves quite satisfied with their performances, if they can supply readers with a crude mass of ill-digested matter, and overwhelm opponents with words. There are, however, among writers of this age, clear traces and seeds of that three-fold form of teaching theology, which still obtains both with Greeks and Latins. For some collected together sentences from the ancient doctors and councils, backed by citations from the Scriptures. Such was *Isidore* of Seville, among the Latins, whose *three Books of sentences* are still extant; and among the Greeks, *Leontius* of Cyprus, whose *Common Places*, compiled from the works of the ancients, have been commended. From these originated that species of theology which the Latins afterwards called *Positive Theology*. Others attempted to unfold the nature of religious doctrines by reasoning; which was the method generally adopted by those who disputed against the Nestorians, Eutychians, and Pelagians. These may be fitly called *Scholastics*. Others again, who call themselves *Mystics*, believed that all divine truth must be learned by internal feeling and contemplation. This three-fold method of treating religious subjects has continued down to the present day. A regular and well-arranged system of theology in all its branches no one produced; but light was thrown repeatedly upon various parts of it.

§ 6. To illustrate and inculcate piety and Christian duty, some gave *precepts*, while others employed *examples*. Those who gave precepts for a pious life, endeavoured to form the Christian character either of persons engaged in the business of active life, or of those more perfect, and removed from the contagious influence of the world. A Christian life, in the former case, they represent as consisting in certain external virtues and badges of piety; as appears from the homilies and exhortations of *Cæsarius*, the Monitory Chapters of *Agapetus*, and especially from the Summary of a Virtuous Life, by *Martin* of Braga.¹ In the latter case, they would separate the soul, by contemplation, from the intercourse of the body; and therefore advised to macerate the body by watching, fasting, constant prayer, and singing of hymns; as is manifest from *Fulgentius* on fasting, *Nicetius* on the Vigils of the servants of God, and on the advantages of Psalmody. The Greeks followed as their leader in these matters, for the most part, *Dionysius*, denominated the Areopagite; on whom *John* of Scythopolis, during this age, published annotations. How great faults are connected with all these views, is visible to every one who is acquainted with the Holy Scriptures.

§ 7. To inculcate piety by *examples* was the aim of all those who wrote *Lives of the Saints*. The number of these, both among the

¹ See *Acta Sanctor. Martii*, iii. 86, &c. [and *Biblioth. Patr.* x. 382. Tr.]

Greeks and the Latins, was very considerable. *Ennodius*, *Eugypsius*, *Cyril* of Scythopolis, *Dionysius Exiguus*, *Cogitosus*, and others, are well known. Nearly all these entertain their readers with marvellous and silly fables; and propose for imitation none but delirious persons or those of perverted minds, who did violence to nature, and adopted austere and fantastic rules of life. To endure hunger and thirst without repining, to go naked about the country like madmen, to immure themselves in a narrow place, to wait with closed eyes for an indescribable divine light; this was accounted holy and glorious. The less any one resembled a sane man with all his wits about him, the more confidently might he hope to obtain a post of high distinction among heroes and demi-gods.

§ 8. In efforts to settle theological controversies, many were diligent, none successful. Scarcely an individual can be named who contended against the Eutychians, Nestorians, or Pelagians, with fairness, sobriety, and moderation. *Primasius* and *Philoponus* treated of all the heresies: but time has swept away their works. A book of *Leontius*, on the sects, is extant; but it deserves little praise. Against the Jews, *Isidore* of Seville, and *Leontius* of Neapolis, engaged in controversy; with what dexterity may easily be conjectured by those who reflect on the circumstances of the age. It will be better, therefore, to proceed to a brief account of the controversies themselves, that disturbed the church in this century, than to treat in detail of these miserable disputants.

§ 9. Although *Origen* lay under the condemnation of many decrees and decisions, his popularity was found, especially among the monks, to defy all bounds. In the West one *Bellator* translated various books by him into Latin.¹ In the East, particularly in Syria and Palestine, which were the principal seats of Origenism, the monks contended for the authority and truth of his opinions with a vehemence almost beyond belief; and they had the approbation of certain bishops, especially of *Theodore*, who filled the see of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia.² The subject being brought before the emperor *Justinian*, he issued a long and full edict, addressed to *Mennas*, the bishop of Constantinople, in which he strongly condemned *Origen* and his opinions, and forbade them to be taught.³ Soon after, however, began the contest about the *three Chapters*, and Origenism not only revived in Palestine, but also made fresh progress. These commotions were brought to a termination by the fifth [general] council, at Constantinople, assembled by *Justinian* in the year 553, when *Origen* and his adherents were again condemned.⁴

¹ [This is founded on a conjecture of Huet (*Origeniana*, p. 252), who ascribes the Latin translation of Origen's Homilies on Matthew, in particular, to this Bellator. *Schl.*]

² See Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabæ*; in Jo. Bapt. Cotelier, *Monumenta Eccles. Græcæ*, p. 370, &c., and Hen. Noris, *Diss. de Synodo Quinta*, cap. i. ii. in his *Opp.* i. 554.

³ This decree is extant in Jo. Harduin, *Concilia*, iii. 243, &c. [It was first published by Baronius, *Annal. Eccl.* ad. ann. 538. *Tr.*]

⁴ See the decree of the council, in Jo. Harduin, *Concilia*, iii. 283, &c. See also Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 38, and on this whole subject, see Ja. Basnage, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, t. i. lib. x. c. 6, p. 517, &c. Pet. Dan. Huet,

§ 10. This controversy produced another, which was much more lasting and violent; but which, as to the subject of it, was far less important. The emperor *Justinian* burned with zeal to extirpate the more strenuous *Monophysites*, who were called *Acephali*. On this subject he consulted *Theodore* of Cæsarea, a friend to Origenism, and a Monophysite as well. By this prelate a new controversy was thought likely to gain peace for the Origenists. He wished besides to fasten

Origeniana, lib. ii. p. 224. Lud. Doucin, Diss. subjoined to his *Historia Origeniana*, p. 345, &c. [Schroëckh, *Kirchengesch.* xviii. 40—58, but especially Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* vii. 618—760.—This contest respecting Origen began among the Palestine monks, about 520. One Nonnus with three other monks belonging to the new *Laura* were discovered to hold and to be propagating the opinions of Origen. Sabas, abbot of the old *Laura*, and supervisor of all the Palestine monks, opposed the schismatics. They were rejected from the *Laura*; but were restored again; and in spite of opposition and persecution, they brought over many in both *Lauras* to their views. The commotion became violent, and expulsions, fighting, and bloodshed ensued. Still it was only a contest among a few monks, living in two little societies or neighbourhoods in Palestine. Justinian's decree, addressed to Mennas, was probably issued about 540; and it has been supposed that the council of Constantinople, which anathematized fifteen errors of Origen, was an accidental council, held about 541; and not the general council held in 553. However that may be, the death of Nonnus in 546 caused the Origenist party among the monks to become divided, and to fall into a declining state. The fullest enumeration of errors held by the Origenists, which has come down to us, is that of the fifteen anathemas by the council of Constantinople. Yet Justinian's decree, or letter to Mennas, is nearly as full; and it is more precise and lucid, as well as better substantiated by references to the works of Origen. In this decree, after a concise introduction, the emperor proceeds, like a theologian, through ten folio pages, to enumerate and confute the errors of Origen. He then directs the patriarch Mennas to assemble what bishops and abbots could be found at Constantinople, and condemn the subjoined list of Origenian errors, their doings to be afterwards transmitted to all bishops and abbots for their confirmation; so that after this general consent shall be obtained, no bishop or abbot may be ordained, without his condemnation of Origenism as well as the other heresies. The list of errors to be condemned is subjoined as follows:—1. If any one says or believes,

that human souls *pre-existed*, i.e. were once mere spirits, and holy; that having become weary of divine contemplation, they were brought into a worse condition; and that, because they ἀποψύχασας, i.e. cooled down as to the love of God, they were therefore called in Greek ψυχὰς, that is, souls; and were sent down to inhabit bodies, as a punishment; let him be anathema.—2. If any one says or believes, that the soul of our Lord pre-existed; and that it was united to God the Word, before his incarnation and birth of the Virgin; let him be anathema.—3. If any one says or believes, that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was first formed in the womb of the blessed Virgin, as those of other men are; and that afterwards God the Word and the pre-existent soul became united with it; let him be anathema.—4. If any one says or believes, that God the Word was made like to all the celestial orders, that to the Cherubim he was made a Cherub, and to the Seraphim a Seraph, and to all the celestial Virtues one like them; let him be anathema.—5. If any one says or believes, that in the resurrection, the bodies of men will be raised orbicular, and does not confess that we shall be resuscitated erect; let him be anathema.—6. If any one says or believes, that heaven, the sun, the moon, the stars, and the waters above the heavens, are animated, and are a sort of material Virtues; let him be anathema.—7. If any one says or believes, that Christ the Lord is to be crucified in the future world, for the devils, as he was in this for men; let him be anathema.—8. If any one says or believes, that the power of God is limited; and that he created all things he could comprehend; let him be anathema.—9. If any one says or believes, that the punishment of devils and wicked men will be temporary, and will have an end; or that there will be a recovery and restoration of devils and wicked men; let him be anathema.—10. And Anathema to Origen, who is called Adamantius, together with his nefarious, execrable, and abominable doctrine; and to every one who believes it, or in any manner presumes at all to defend it at any time; in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen. Tr.]

some stigma upon the council of Chalcedon, and to inflict an incurable wound on the Nestorians. He persuaded the emperor accordingly, that the *Acephali* would return to the church, if only the Acts of the council of Chalcedon were purged of those three passages, or *three Chapters*, in which *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrus, and *Ibas* of Edessa, were acquitted of error; and certain writings of these men, favourable to the Nestorian errors, were condemned. Theodore was believed; and the emperor, in the year 544, ordered those three chapters to be expunged, but without prejudice to the authority of the council of Chalcedon.¹ This edict, however, was resisted by the bishops of the West and of Africa, especially by *Vigilius*, the Roman pontiff, who complained of great injury done by it, not only to the council of Chalcedon, but also to men now among the blessed.² *Justinian* summoned *Vigilius* to Constantinople, and compelled him to condemn the *three Chapters*. But the African and Illyrian bishops, on the other hand, compelled *Vigilius* to revoke that condemnation. For no one of them would own him for a bishop and

¹ This decree is extant in Jo. Harduin, *Concilia*, iii. 287, &c. Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 38. [It is called *Justinian's Creed*; and professes to define the catholic faith, as established by the first four general councils, those of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and to condemn the opposite errors. Mosheim's description of the *three Chapters* would lead us to suppose that certain chapters, sections, or paragraphs, in the *Acts of the council of Chalcedon*, were the three things condemned by Justinian. But this was not the fact. His decree does not avowedly condemn anything contained in the Acts of that council; nor does it use the phrase *three Chapters*. The phrase was afterwards brought into use, and denoted three subjects (*capitula*, κεφάλαια), which were condemned by the decree of Justinian; viz. 1, the person and writings of *Theodorus*, bishop of Mopsuestia, whom the decree pronounced a heretic, and a Nestorian; 2, the writings of *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrus; not universally, but only so far as they favoured Nestorianism, or opposed Cyril of Alexandria, and his twelve anathemas; and, 3, an *Epistle* said to have been written by *Ibas*, bishop of Edessa, to one Maris, a Persian, which censured Cyril and the first council of Ephesus, and favoured the cause of Nestorius. The council of Chalcedon had passed no decree respecting *Theodorus*; and it had left all the three bishops in good standing, though the epistle of *Ibas* and some of the writings of *Theodoret* received censure. Hence Justinian's decree did not openly and avowedly contravene the decisions at Chalcedon; though virtually, and in effect, it did so. To understand the contest about the three *Chapters*, it should be

remembered, that the Nestorians, who separated the two natures of Christ too much, and the Eutychians or Monophysites, who commingled them too much, were the two extremes; between which the orthodox took their stand, condemning both. But the orthodox themselves did not all think alike. Some, in their zeal against the Nestorians, came near to the Monophysite ground; and these of course felt willing to condemn the three Chapters. Others, zealous only against the Monophysites, were not far from being Nestorians; and these of course defended the three Chapters; for *Theodorus*, *Theodoret*, and *Ibas* had been leading men of this very character. Hence the interest shown by the oriental bishops in this controversy. But in the West, where the Nestorian and Eutychian contests had been less severe, and where the persons and writings of *Theodorus*, *Ibas*, and *Theodoret* were little known; the *three Chapters* were felt to be of little consequence, except as the condemning them seemed to impair the authority of the decrees of Chalcedon, and to asperse characters once held venerable in the church.—It was doubtless a most rash thing, in Justinian, to condemn the three Chapters. But having done it, he resolved to persevere in it. The church was agitated long and severely; and at length this precipitate act of the emperor, being sanctioned by the requisite authority, had the effect to shape the creed of the catholic church, from that day to this. See Walch, *Hist. Ket.* viii. 3—468, but especially, 437, &c. *Tr.*]

² Hen. Noris, *de Synodo Quinta*, cap. x. &c. Opp. i. 579. Ja. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. l. x. c. vi. p. 523, &c. [also Walch, *bi supra*.]

a brother, until he had approved those three chapters. *Justinian* on the other hand condemned the three chapters by a new edict, in the year 551.

§ 11. After various contentions, it was thought best to leave this controversy for decision to a council of the whole church. *Justinian*, therefore, in the year 553, assembled at Constantinople what is called the *fifth general council*. In this council, besides *Origen's* opinions,¹ the *three Chalcedonian Chapters*, as the emperor wished, were pronounced noxious to the church; really, however, by the Eastern bishops, for very few from the West were present. *Vigilius*, then at Constantinople, would not assent to the decrees of this council. He was therefore treated with indignity by the emperor, and sent into banishment; nor did he return till he received the decrees of this fifth council.² *Pelagius*, his successor, and the subsequent Roman pontiffs, in like manner, received those decrees. But neither *their* authority, nor that of the emperors, could prevail with the Western bishops to follow their example. Many of them, indeed, on this account seceded from communion with the Roman pontiff; nor could this great wound be healed, except by length of time.³

§ 12. Another considerable controversy broke out among the Greeks, in the year 519; namely, *Whether it could properly be said, that one of the Trinity was crucified*. Many adopted this language, in order to press harder upon the *Nestorians*, who separated the natures of *Christ* too much. Among these were the Scythian monks at Constantinople, who were the principal movers of this controversy. But others argued against this language as allied to the error of the *Theopaschites* or Eutychians, and therefore rejected it. With these, *Hormisdas*, bishop of Rome, when consulted by the Scythian monks, having agreed, great and pernicious altercations ensued. Afterwards, the fifth council, and *John II.*, who succeeded *Hormisdas*, by approving of this language, restored peace to the church.⁴ Connected with this question was another: *Whether Christ's person could be rightly called compounded?* which the Scythian monks affirmed, and others denied.

¹ [According to the acts of this council, as they have come down to us, Origen was no otherwise condemned by this general council, than by having his name inserted in the list of heretics, collectively anathematized in the 11th anathema. The celebrated 15 anathemas of as many Origenian errors, said to have been decreed by this council, are found in no copy of its Acts; nor are they mentioned by any ancient writer. Peter Lambecius first discovered them in the imperial library at Vienna, in an old MS. of Photius' *Syntagma Canonum*, bearing the superscription, "Canons of the 165 holy Fathers of the fifth holy council at Constantinople;" and published them with a Latin translation; whence Baluze first introduced them into the Collections of Councils. But Cave, Walch, Valesius, and others, suppose they were framed in a

council at Constantinople, about 541. See note⁴ p. 421; Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, i. 558; Walch, *Hist. Kitz.* vii. 644. 761; Valesius, note on Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 38. Tr.]

² See Peter de Marca, *Diss. de Decreto Vigili pro Confirmatione Synodi Quintæ*; among the Dissertations subjoined to his work, *de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, p. 207, &c. [and Bower's *Lives of the Popes* (Vigilius), ii. 382—413. Tr.]

³ See in preference to all others, Hen. Noris, *de Synodo Quinta Œcumenica*; yet Noris is not free from partiality. Also Christ. Lupus, Notes on the fifth Council, among his *Adnotat. ad Concilia*.

⁴ See Hen. Noris, *Historia Controversiæ de uno ex Trinitate passo*; Opp. iii. 771. The ancient writers who mention this controversy, call the monks, with whom it originated, Scythians; but Matur. Veiss. la

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES.

§ 1. Rites multiplied—§ 2. Explanations of the ceremonies—§ 3. Public worship. The Eucharist. Baptism—§ 4. Temples. Festivals.

§ 1. In proportion as true religion and piety, from various causes, declined in this century, the external signs of religion and piety, that is, rites and ceremonies, were augmented. In the East, the Nestorian and Eutychian contests occasioned the invention of various rites and forms, which might serve as marks to distinguish the contending sects. In the West, *Gregory* the Great was wonderfully dexterous and ingenious in devising and recommending new ceremonies. Nor will this appear strange to those who are aware that he was of the opinion that the words of the Holy Scriptures were *images* of recondite things. For whoever can believe this, can easily bring himself to inculcate all the doctrines and precepts of religion, by means of rites and signs. Yet in one respect, he is to be commended; namely, that he would not obtrude his ceremonies upon others:—perhaps he would not, because he *could* not.

§ 2. This multitude of ceremonies required interpreters. Hence a new kind of science arose, both in the East and in the West, the object of which was to investigate and explain the grounds and reasons of the sacred rites. But most of those who deduce these rites from Scripture and reason, talk nonsense, and exhibit rather the fictions of their own brains than the true causes of things. If they

Croze, Thesaur. Epistolar. iii. 189, conjectures that they were Scetic monks from Egypt, and not Scythians. This conjecture has some probability. [But *Walch, Hist. Ketz.* vii. 296, 297, says of this conjecture: "it is not only improbable, but is certainly false." And the documents relative to the controversy (of which he had there just closed the recital) do appear, as *Walch* affirms, "adequate to prove, that these men were really from Scythia." Together with the two modes of expression relative to the Trinity, which they advocated, these monks were strenuous opposers of Pelagianism. Having had disagreement with some bishops of their province, particularly with *Paternus*, bishop of *Tomi*, a deputation of them went to Constantinople with their complaint. Among these deputies, *John Maxentius*,

Leontius, and *Achilles* were the principal. The emperor rather favoured them; but the bishops of the East were not agreed. The emperor obliged the pope's legates at the court to hear the cause. But they were not disposed to decide it; at least, not as the monks wished. A part of them now repaired to Rome, where they stayed more than a year. *Hormisdas* disapproved their phraseology, but was not very ready to condemn it outright. While at Rome, these monks wrote to the exiled African bishops in Sardinia, and by taking part in *their* controversy obtained their friendship. They certainly had many friends; but the ancient historians have transmitted to us only some slight notices of their history. See *Walch, Hist. Ketz.* vii. 262—313. *Bower, Lives of the Popes* (*Hormisdas*), ii. 306—309. *Tr.*]

had been acquainted with ancient opinions and customs, and had examined the pontifical laws of the Greeks and Romans, they would have taught much more correctly; for from this source were derived many of the rites which were looked upon as sacred.

§ 3. The public worship of God was still celebrated in the vernacular language of each nation; but it was generally enlarged by various hymns and other minute things. The new mode of administering the *Lord's supper*, magnificently, and with a splendid apparatus, or the *Canon of the Mass*, as it is called, was prescribed by Gregory the Great; or, if it will be more satisfactory, he enlarged and altered the old *Canon*. But many ages elapsed before the other Latin churches could be prevailed on to adopt this Romish form.¹ *Baptism*, except in cases of necessity, was conferred only upon festivals, and those also the greater ones, or of the highest class.² Upon the *Litanies*, as they are called,³ to saints, the various kinds of supplications, the *stations* of Gregory,⁴ the forms of *consecration*, and other rites, invented in this century, to act upon men's eyes and ears by a certain semblance of religion, I shall not speak, for fear of being long. This matter could not be carefully and industriously treated without a separate work.

§ 4. The temples erected in memory and honour of the saints were immensely numerous, both in the East and the West.⁵ There had long been houses enough everywhere in which people met to worship God; but this age courted the favour of departed saints, with these edifices, as with presents, nor did it doubt that the saints took the provinces, cities, towns, and lands, in which they saw residences prepared for them, under their protection against every ill.⁶ The number of feast-days almost equalled that of the churches. In particular, the list of festivals for the whole Christian body was swelled by the

¹ See Theod. Chr. Lilienthal, *de Canone Missæ Gregoriano*, Lugd. Bat. 1740, 8vo, and the writers on Liturgies. [Different countries had different Missals. Not only the East differed from the West, but in both there were diversities. In Gaul, the old Liturgy continued till the time of Charles the Great. In Milan, the Ambrosian Liturgy (so named from St. Ambrose, bishop of Milan) is not yet wholly abandoned. In Spain, the Mozarabic, or ancient Spanish, is still used occasionally in certain places, though the Roman canon was introduced partially in the eleventh, and more fully in the thirteenth and following centuries. In England the ancient Britons had one Liturgy; and the Anglo-Saxons received another from Augustine their apostle and his companions; and this not precisely the Roman. See Krazer, *de Liturgiis*, sec. ii. chap. 2—6. Gregory the Great introduced the responsive chant, and established a school for church music, which was in existence at Rome as late as the ninth century. *Tr.*]

² [Especially Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Whitsuntide, and St. John the Baptist, at least in Gaul. See Gregory of Tours, *de Gloria Confessor*, c. 69, 76, and *Historia Francor.* viii. 9. *Schl.*]

³ [Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, i. 279, shows that there is no evidence of the use of Invocation of Saints in Litanies before the eighth century. *Ed.*]

⁴ [Stations denoted, in early times, *fasts*; but afterwards the *churches, chapels, cemeteries*, or other places where the people assembled for worship. (See du Cange, *Glossar. Med. et. Infim. Latinit.* sub hac voce.) Gregory discriminated the different times, occasions, and places of public worship, and framed a service for each. This is the principal cause of the vast multiplication of liturgical formulas in the Romish church. *Tr.*]

⁵ [See Procopius, *de Bello Gothico*, lib. iv. and v.; also *de Edificiis Justiniani*, where is mention of many churches erected to the Virgin Mary. *Schl.*]

⁶ [Thus, the Lombard queen, Theodelinda,

consecration of the day of the *purification of the holy virgin Mary*, that the people might not miss their *Lupercalia*, which they were accustomed to celebrate in the month of February,¹ by the day of our *Saviour's conception*,² by the birth-day of *St. John*,³ and some others.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF HERESIES AND SEPARATIONS FROM THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Remains of the ancient sects. Manichæans. Pelagians — § 2. Donatists — § 3. Arians — § 4. State of the Nestorians — § 5. Eutychian contests. Severus — § 6. Jac. Baradaeus, the father of the Monophysites — § 7. Their state — § 8. Controversies among them — § 9. The Agnoëtæ — § 10. Tritheists.

§ 1. THE ancient sects, though harassed in numberless ways, did not cease to raise dangerous commotions in various places. Among the Persians, the Manichæans are said to have become so powerful as to

built a church for John the Baptist, that he might pray for her and her people. (Paul Diacon. *Hist. Longobard.* iv. 7.) And the French king, Clothaire, built a splendid temple to St. Vincent, because he believed *that saint had helped him to vanquish the Goths.* (Sigebert, *Chronic.*) For the same reason rich presents were made to the churches. Thus Childebert, after conquering Alaric, gave to the church sixty cups, fifteen dishes, and twenty cases for the holy Gospels; all of the finest gold, and set with costly gems. (Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francor.* iii. 10.) *Schl.*]

¹ [This was instituted in the reign of Justinian, and fixed to the second day of February. The Greeks called it *ἡ παντή*, or *ὑπαπαντή*, *meeting*; because then Simeon and Anna met the Saviour in the temple. The Latins call it the *feast of St. Simeon*, the *presentation of the Lord*, and *Candlemas*, because many candles were then lighted up; as had been done on the *Lupercalia*, the festival of the ravishment of Proserpine, whom her mother Ceres searched for with candles. See Hospinian, *de Festis Christianor.* p. 52, &c. *Tr.*]

² [This feast is generally celebrated the 25th of March; and is called by the Greeks *ἡμέρα ἀσπασμοῦ*, sive *εὐαγγελισμοῦ*, the *day of the salutation*, or of the *annunciation*; because on it the angel Gabriel announced to Mary that she should bring forth the Saviour. The Latins call it the *annunciation of Mary*. To avoid interrupting the

Lent fast, the Spaniards celebrated it on the 18th of December, and the Armenians on the 5th of January; the other churches kept it the 25th of March. It is mentioned in the 52nd canon of the council in Trullo, A.D. 691, as a festival then fully established and known, but at what time it was first introduced is uncertain. See Suicer, *Thesaur. Eccles.* i. 1234. *Tr.*]

³ [I know not what induced Mosheim to place the introduction of this feast in this century. If the superscriptions to the homilies of Maximus of Turin (who lived A.D. 420) are correct, this feast must have been common in the fifth century; for three of these homilies are superscribed, as being composed for this feast. Perhaps Mosheim had his eye on the twenty-first canon of the council held at Agde, A.D. 506 (Harduin's Collection, ii. 1000), where the festival of St. John is mentioned among the greater feasts. Yet as it is there mentioned as one already known, it must have been in existence some years. Moreover heathenish rites were mixed with this feast. The feast of St. John, and the dancing around a tree set up, were usages, as well of the German and northern nations, as of the Romans. The former had their Noodfyr (on which Joh. Reiske published a book, Francf. 1696, 8vo.), and the latter used, about this time [the 24th of June] to keep the feast of Vesta, with kindling a new fire, amid dances and other sports. *Schl.*]

seduce even the son of *Cabades* the king : but he avenged the crime, by making a great slaughter of them. They must also have been troublesome in other countries ; for *Heracianus* of Chalcedon wrote a book against them.¹ In Gaul and Africa, the contests between the semi-Pelagians and the followers of *Augustine* continued.

§ 2. The Donatists were comfortably situated so long as the Vandals reigned in Africa. But they were less favoured when this kingdom was overturned in the year 534. Yet they not only kept up their church, but near the close of the century, or from the year 591, ventured to defend it with more courage, and to extend its influence. These efforts of theirs were vigorously opposed by *Gregory* the Great ; who, as appears from his *Epistles*,² endeavoured in various ways to depress the sect now raising its head again. And his measures, doubtless, were successful ; for the Donatist church became extinct in this century ; at least no mention is made of it at any subsequent time.

§ 3. The Arians, at the commencement of this century, were triumphant in some parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Not a few of the Asiatic bishops favoured them. The Vandals in Africa, the Goths in Italy, many of the Gauls, the Suevi, the Burgundians, and the Spaniards, openly espoused their interest. The Greeks, indeed, who approved of the Nicene council, oppressed and also punished them, where they could ; but the Arians returned the like treatment, especially in Africa and Italy.³ This prosperity of the Arians wholly terminated when, under the auspices of *Justinian*, the Vandals were driven from Africa, and the Goths from Italy.⁴ For the other Arian kings, *Sigismund*, king of the Burgundians, *Theodimir*, king of the Suevi in Lusitania, and *Reccared*, king of Spain, without violence and war, suffered themselves to be led to a renunciation of the Arian doctrine, and to efforts for its extirpation among their subjects by means of legal enactments and councils. Whether reason and arguments, or hope and fear, had the greater influence in the conversion of these kings, it is difficult to say. But this is certain, that the Arian sect was from this time dispersed, and could never afterwards recover any strength.

§ 4. The Nestorians, after they had obtained a fixed residence in Persia, and had fixed the head of their sect at Seleucia, were as successful as they were industrious, in disseminating their doctrines in the countries lying without the Roman empire. It appears from unquestionable documents still existing, that there were numerous societies in all parts of Persia, in India, in Armenia, in Arabia, in

¹ See Photius, *Biblioth.* Cod. cxiv. p. 291.

² See his *Epistolar.* iv. 34, 35, p. 714, 715, and vi. 65, p. 841, 37, p. 821, and ix. 53, p. 972, and ii. 48, p. 611. Op. tom. ii. [The emperor Mauricius issued penal laws against them in 595. It is a probable conjecture of Witsius (*Historia Donatist.* cap. viii. § 9), that the conquest of the Saracens in Africa, in the seventh century, put an end to the Donatist contest. *Schl.*]

³ Procopius, *de Bello Vandal.* i. 3, and *de Bello Gothico*, i. 2. Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 15, &c.

⁴ See Joh. Ja. Mascovii, *Historia Germanor.* t. ii. on the subversion of the Vandalic kingdom, p. 76, of that of the Goths, p. 91. On the accession of the barbarians to the Nicene faith respecting God, see *Acta Sanctor.* Martii, ii. 275, and Aprilis, ii. 134.

Syria, and in other countries, under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Seleucia, during this century.¹ The Persian kings were not, indeed, all equally well affected towards this sect; and they sometimes severely persecuted all Christians resident in their dominions:² yet generally their disposition was far more favourable towards the Nestorians than to those who followed the council of Ephesus; for they suspected the latter to be spies of the Greeks, with whom they agreed as to religion.

§ 5. The sect of the *Monophysites* was no less favourably situated; and it drew over to its side a great part of the East. In the first place, the emperor *Anastasius*³ was attached to the sect and to the dogmas of the *Acephali*, or more rigid *Monophysites*;⁴ and he did not hesitate, on the removal of *Flavianus* from the see of Antioch, in 513, to prefer in his place *Severus* a learned monk of Palestine, who was devoted to that sect, and from whom the *Monophysites* took the name of *Severians*.⁵ This man (*Severus*) exerted all his powers to destroy the credit of the council of Chalcedon in the East, and to strengthen the party which professed but *one nature* in Christ: and his zealous efforts produced most grievous commotions.⁶ But the emperor *Anastasius* dying in the year 518, *Severus* was expelled from his see; and the sect which he had so zealously propagated, was restrained and depressed by *Justin* and the succeeding emperors, to such a degree, that it seemed very near ruin: it nevertheless elected *Sergius* for its patriarch, in place of *Severus*.⁷

§ 6. When the *Monophysites* were all but hopeless of preservation, and very few of their bishops remained, some of them being dead, and others in captivity, an obscure man, *Jacobus*, surnamed *Baraddeus*, or *Zanzabul*, to distinguish him from others of the name, restored their fallen state.⁸ He was a monk, with no resources but

¹ Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana*, lib. ii. p. 125, in Bern. de Montfaucon, *Collectio Nova Patrum Græcor.* of which, the Preface, p. xi. &c. is worth reading.

² Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* t. iii. pt. i. p. 109, 407, 411, 441, 449, and t. iii. pt. ii. c. v. § 2, p. lxxxiii. &c.

³ [A.D. 491—518. Tr.]

⁴ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 30, 44, &c. Theodorus Lector, *H. E.* ii. p. 562. A catalogue of the Works of *Severus*, collected from MS. copies, is in Bernh. de Montfaucon's *Biblioth. Coisliniana*, p. 53, &c. [According to Evagrius, l. c. *Anastasius* was not zealous for any party; but was a great lover of peace, and determined neither to make, nor to suffer, any change in the ecclesiastical constitution; that is, he adhered to the *Henoticon* of Zeno his predecessor. This was taking the middle ground; for the more strenuous *Monophysites* rejected the *Henoticon*, and insisted on an explicit condemnation of the council of Chalcedon; while the more rigid catholics, who also disliked the

Henoticon, were for holding fast every title of the decisions of Chalcedon. See Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* vi. 930, 946—8. Tr.]

⁵ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* ii. 47, 321, &c. Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 127, 129, 130, 135, 138, &c. [See a notice of *Severus*, above, ch. ii. § 8, note. Tr.]

⁶ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 33. Cyrillus, *Vita Sabæ*, in Jo. Bapt. Cotelier's *Monumenta Eccles. Græcæ*, iii. 312. *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. Critique*, t. i. art. *Anastasius*.

⁷ See Abulpharaji *Series Patriarch. Antiochen.* in Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* ii. 323. [For a full and minute examination of the *Monophysite* history, see Walch's *Historie der Ketzereyen*, namely, during the reign of *Anastasius*, vi. 936—1054; under *Justin*, vii. 52—128; and under *Justinian*, *ibid.* p. 128—362. Tr.]

⁸ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, t. ii. c. viii. p. 62, 72, 326, 331, 414, &c. Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.* p. 119, 133, 425, &c., and *Liturgie Oriental.* ii. 333, 342.

constancy of mind, and extraordinary patience of labour, who, being consecrated bishop by some prelates confined in prison, travelled over all the East, on foot, constituted a vast number of bishops and presbyters, revived everywhere the drooping spirits of the Monophysites, and effected so much by his eloquence and astonishing diligence, that when he died, in the year 578, at Edessa, where he had been bishop, he left his sect most flourishing in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, and other countries.¹ He extinguished nearly all the dissensions among the Monophysites: and as their churches were so widely dispersed in the East, that a single bishop at Antioch could not well govern them all, he associated with him a *Maphrian* or *primate* of the East, whose residence was at *Tagritum*, on the borders of Armenia.² His efforts were not a little aided in Egypt and the neighbouring regions, by *Theodosius* of Alexandria. From this man, as the second father of the sect, all the Monophysites in the East are called *Jacobites*.

§ 7. Thus the imprudence of the Greeks, and their inconsiderate zeal for maintaining the truth, caused the Monophysites to become consolidated into a permanent body. From this period, the whole community has been under the government of two bishops or *patriarchs*, one of Alexandria and the other of Antioch, who, notwithstanding a disagreement between the Syrians and Egyptians, in some particulars, are very careful to maintain communion with each other, by letters and kind offices. Under the patriarch of Alexandria, is the *primate* or *Abbuna* of the Abyssinians; and under the patriarch of Antioch, the *Maphrian* or *primate* of the East, whose residence is at *Tagritum* in Mesopotamia. The Armenians have their own bishop, and are distinguished from the other Monophysites by some peculiar rites and opinions.

§ 8. Before the sect of the Monophysites could acquire this organisation and strength, various disagreements and controversies prevailed among them; and particularly at Alexandria, a difficult, knotty question was moved concerning the body of Christ. *Julian* of Halicarnassus,³ in the year 519, maintained that the divine nature

Faustus Nairon, *Euoplia Fidei Catholicae ex Syrorum Monumentis*, pt. i. p. 40, 41. [Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* viii. 481—490. Jacobus Baradaeus was a Syrian monk, and a pupil of Severus, archbishop of Antioch. His ordination is placed by some in 545, by others in 551. Some call him bishop of Edessa; others make him to have been bishop at large. The number of bishops, priests, and deacons ordained by him is reported to have been 100,000. That he put an end to the divisions and contests among the Monophysites, as Mosheim asserts, is not stated in any of the authorities quoted by Walch. As the Monophysites, all over the East, are to this day called Jacobites, from this Jacobus Baradaeus; so the orthodox Greeks are called Melchites, from the Syrian,

Melcha, a king, as being adherents to the religion of the imperial court. *Tr.*] [The Jacobites themselves trace their name from St. James, our Lord's brother, or from Dioscorus, who is said to have been also called James. Neale, *Patr. Alex.* ii. 7. *Ed.*]

¹ For the Nubians and Abyssinians, see Asseman, loc. cit. ii. 330. Hieron. Lobo, *Voyage d'Abyssinie*, ii. 36. Job. Ludolph, *Comment. ad Historiam Ethiop.* p. 451, 461, 466. For the other countries, see the writers of their history.

² Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* ii. 410, 414, 418, likewise his *Dissert. de Monophysitis*, prefixed to t. ii. of this *Bibliotheca*.

³ [Julian is noticed among the writers of the century, above, c. ii. § 8, note. *Tr.*]

had so insinuated itself into the body of *Christ*, from the very moment of conception, as to change its nature, and render it *incorruptible*. With him agreed *Cajanus* [or *Gajanus*] of Alexandria; from whom believers in this opinion were called *Cajanists*.¹ The advocates of this doctrine became divided into three parties; two of which disagreed on the question, whether *Christ's* body was *created* or *uncreated*; and the third maintained, that *Christ's* body was indeed corruptible, but on account of the influence of the divine nature, never became in fact corrupted. This sect was vigorously resisted by the celebrated *Severus* of Antioch, and *Damianus*, who maintained that the body of *Christ*, before his resurrection, was *corruptible*, that is, was liable to the ordinary changes of human nature. Those who agreed with *Julian*, were called *Aphthartodocetæ*, *Docetæ*, *Phantasiastæ*, and also *Manicheans*; because, from their opinion, it might be inferred that *Christ* did not *really* suffer, feel hungry, fall asleep, and experience the other sensations of a man; but that he only *appeared* to suffer, sleep, be hungry, thirsty. Those who agreed with *Severus*, were called *Phthartolatræ*, and *Ktistolatræ* or *Creaticolæ*. This controversy was agitated with great warmth in the reign of *Justinian*, who favoured the *Aphthartodocetæ*: but it afterwards gradually subsided.² A middle path between the two parties was taken by *Xenaias*, or *Philoxenus* of Maubug;³ for he and his associates held, that *Christ* really suffered what happens to our nature, but from no physical compulsion, only from choice.⁴

§ 9. Some of the *Corrupticolæ*, as they were called, particularly *Themistius*, a deacon of Alexandria, and *Theodosius*, bishop of that city, in the ardour of disputation, fell upon another sentiment towards the close of this century,⁵ which caused new commotions. They affirmed that while all things were known by the *divine* nature of *Christ*, to his *human* nature which was united with it, many things were unknown. As they admitted but one nature in *Christ*, others interpreted their doctrine as making the divine nature a participator in this ignorance; and hence they were called *Agnoëtæ*.⁶ But this

¹ [Gajanus was archdeacon of Alexandria, under the patriarch Timotheus III.: and on his death, in 536, elected patriarch by the monks and the populace, in opposition to Theodosius, the bishop of the court party. Great commotions now existed in Alexandria; and Gajanus was soon deposed. He fled first to Carthage, and then to Sardinia; and we hear little more about him. See *Liberatus*, *Breviar.* cap. 20, and *Leontius*, *de Sectis*, art. v. *Tr.*]

² Timotheus, *de Receptione Hæreticor.* in Jo. Bapt. Cotelier's *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Gr.* iii. 409. *Liberatus*, *Breviarium Controv.* cap. 20. Jo. Forbes, *Instructiones Historico-theologicæ*, l. iii. c. 18, 108, &c. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 467. [The contests respecting the corruptibility of *Christ's* body, both among the Monophy-

sites and the orthodox, are fully examined, in Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* viii. 550—644. *Tr.*]

³ [Or Hierapolis. *Tr.*]

⁴ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient.* *Vatic.* ii. 22, and 168, &c.

⁵ [This controversy began before the middle of the century; for *Themistius* was a deacon under Timotheus III., who died in 536. *Theodosius* succeeded in that year, but was removed about 537. The heat of the controversy seems to have been about 550 or 560; yet it was rife in the time of Gregory the Great, and the sect existed till some time in the seventh century. *Tr.*]

⁶ Jo. Bapt. Cotelier, in the *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Gr.* iii. 641. Mich. Le Quien, on *Damascenus de Hæresibus*, i. 107. Jo. Forbes, *Instructiones Historico-theol.* l. iii. c. 19, p. 119. Photius, *Biblioth. Codex cxxx.* p. 882.

new sect was feeble; and therefore wasted away sooner than might have been anticipated from the animated eloquence of the disputants.

§ 10. From the controversies with the Monophysites, arose the sect of the *Tritheists*. Its author was one *John Ascunage*, a Syrian philosopher, and a Monophysite.¹ This man imagined that there were in God three natures, or substances, numerically distinct, and connected by no common bond of *essence*: from which dogma, his adversaries deduced *Tritheism*. Among the patrons of this opinion, no one was more celebrated than *John Philoponus*, a grammarian and philosopher of great fame at Alexandria: who hence by many was accounted founder of the sect; and the members of it have been called *Philoponists*.² As the sect advanced, it became divided into two parties, the *Philoponists* and the *Cononites*; the latter being so named from its leader, *Conon*, bishop of *Tursus*.³ These parties agreed respecting the doctrine of three Persons in the Godhead, but were at variance respecting the explanation of the doctrine concerning the *resurrection* of our bodies. For *Philoponus* maintained that both the *matter* and the *form* of all bodies were generated, and corruptible; and, therefore, that both would be resuscitated at the resurrection: but *Conon* held, that the *matter* only, and not the form, of bodies was corruptible and to be resuscitated.⁴ To both these stood opposed the *Damianists*: so named from *Damianus*⁵ of Alexandria. These made a distinction between the divine *essence* and the three *Persons* of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In other words, they denied that each Person, by himself and in nature, was God; but maintained that the

[Walch has given a full and satisfactory account of the Agnoëtæ or Themistianî, in his *Hist. Ketz.* viii. 644—684. It appears that the Agnoëtæ merely denied that the human nature of Christ became omniscient, by being united with the divine nature. Nor did their contemporaries in general understand them to go further. But the writers of the middle ages represent them as denying altogether the omniscience of Christ; and many of the moderns, till quite recently, had similar views of this sect. See Walch, l. c. p. 675—679. Tr.]

¹ See Gregory Abulpharajus, in Jos. Sim. Asseman's *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* i. 328, &c. [This is the only ancient writer that mentions this John Ascunage; and his statement is, that this John was a disciple of Samuel Peter, a Syrian philosopher, who taught philosophy twenty years at Constantinople; that John succeeded him in the school; but having advanced his new doctrine, was banished by Justinian. Tr.]

² See Joh. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* lib. v. c. 37, t. ix. p. 358. Jo. Harduin, *Concilia*, iii. 1288. Timotheus, *de Receptione Hæreticor.* in Jo. Bapt. Cotelier's *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Gr.* iii. 414. John Damascenus, *de Hæresibus*, Opp. i. 103, ed. Le Quien. [John Philoponus was born, and probably spent

his life, at Alexandria: he was a literary layman, and deeply read in the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophies; yet he was a Christian, and a Monophysite, as most of the Alexandrians in his day were. The time of his birth and death is unknown; but it appears that he was [an old man in the middle of the sixth century. Gieseler, ii. 95. Ed.]. Whether his own reflexions or the books of John Ascunage first led him to his Tritheism, is uncertain. His works now extant are, a book on the *Hexæmeron*; another on *Easter*; one against *Proclus*, to prove the world not eternal; a book on the *Gr. dialects*; and *Commentaries* on various works of Aristotle: his lost works were, on the *Resurrection*; against the council of *Chalcedon*; against the sentiments of John, archbishop of Constantinople, respecting the Trinity; against *Jamblichus de Simulacris*; against *Severus*; and a book on *Union*, entitled *Διαίτησις* sive *Arbiter*; a valuable extract from which is preserved. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 267, and Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* viii. 702, &c. Tr.]

³ Photius, *Biblioth.* Codex xxiv. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* ii. 329, &c.

⁴ [For a full account, see Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* viii. 762—778. Tr.]

⁵ [The Monophysite patriarch. Tr.]

three Persons had a *common God or divinity*, by an undivided participation of which each one was God. The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they denominated *Hypostases*;¹ and what was common to them, *God, substance, and nature*.²

¹ [Or *Persons*. Tr.]

² Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* ii. 78, 332, &c. [These controversies respecting the Trinity in unity are minutely investigated by Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* viii. 685—762. He concludes that Philoponus and his sect were really, though perhaps unconsciously, Tritheists: for Philoponus held to a merely *specific unity* in God, and not to a *numerical unity*; that is, he taught that the three Persons in the Trinity had a *common nature*, in the same sense that Paul and

Peter had a common nature, and as all the angels have a common nature. (Walch, l. c. p. 728, &c.) The Damianists, on the contrary, rejecting the idea of a mere *specific unity* in God, held the three divine Persons to be *numerically one*, except as distinguished by *certain characteristic marks*: so that they were really on Sabellian ground. (Walch, l. c. p. 753—757.) See also Münscher's *Dogmengeschichte*, iii. 512—716, ed. Marp. 1818. Tr.]

SEVENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPERITY OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Christianity propagated in China — § 2. The English converted — § 3. Also the Gauls, Suevi, Frieslanders, Franks, and Helvetii — § 4. Judgment concerning these Apostles — § 5. Jews compelled to embrace Christianity.

§ 1. THE Christian religion was, in this century, diffused beyond its former bounds, both in the eastern and western countries. In the East, the Nestorians, with incredible industry and perseverance, laboured to propagate it from Persia, Syria, and India, among the barbarous and savage nations inhabiting the deserts and the remotest shores of Asia; and that their zeal was not inefficient, appears from numerous proofs still existing. In particular, the vast empire of China was illumined, by this zeal and industry, with the light of Christianity. Those who regard as genuine and authentic, that very famous *Chinese monument of Sigan*, which was discovered in the seventeenth century, believe that Christianity was introduced into China in the year 636, when *Jesujabas* of Gadala presided over the Nestorian community.¹ And those who look upon this as a fabrica-

¹ This celebrated monument has been published and explained by several persons; in particular by Athan. Kircher, *China Illustrata*, p. 53. Andr. Müller, in a distinct treatise, Berlin, 1672, 4to. Euseb. Renaudot, *Relations Anciennes des Indes et de la Chine, de deux Voyageurs Mahométans*, p. 228—271, Paris, 1718, 8vo. Jos. Sim.

Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, t. iii. pt. ii. c. iv. § 7, p. 538, &c. A more accurate copy, with notes, was expected from the very learned Theoph. Siegf. Bayer, much distinguished for his knowledge of Chinese literature; but his premature death frustrated the expectation. I see no reason why I should not regard this monument as

tion of the Jesuits, may be fully satisfied by other and unexceptionable proofs, that China, especially the northern part of it, contained, in this century, or perhaps even earlier, numerous Christians, over whom presided, during several subsequent centuries, a metropolitan, sent out by the patriarch of the Chaldeans or Nestorians.¹

§ 2. The Greeks were hindered by intestine dissensions, from caring much for the propagation of Christianity among the heathen.² In the West, among the Anglo-Saxons, *Augustine*, till his death in 605, and afterwards, other monks sent from Rome, laboured to extend and enlarge the church. And the result of their labours and efforts was, that the other six Anglo-Saxon kings, who had hitherto continued in paganism, gradually came over to Christianity, and all Britain became professedly Christian.³ Yet we need not believe, that this change was wholly owing to the sermons and exhortations of these Roman monks and teachers; a great part of it is rather to be ascribed to the

genuine; nor can I conceive what advantage the Jesuits could have promised themselves from a fabrication of this sort. See Gabr. Liron, *Singularités Histor. et Littéraires*, ii. 500, &c. [See also Tho. Yeates, *Indian Church History*, p. 85—96, Lond. 1818, 8vo. Kircher's translation of the inscription, with a comment and some notes, is given in the Appendix to Mosheim's *Historia Eccles. Tartarorum*, p. 2—28. The monument is said to be a marble slab, ten feet long, and five broad; dug up in 1625, at a town near Sin-gan-fu, capital of the province Shen-si. The top of the slab is a pyramidal cross. The heading of the inscription consists of nine Chinese words, formed into a square, and is thus translated: "This stone was erected to the honour and eternal memory of the Law of Light and Truth brought from Ta-cin [Judea, or Syria], and promulgated in China." The principal inscription is in Chinese characters, and consists of twenty-eight columns, each containing sixty-two words. It first states the fundamental principles of Christianity, and then recounts the arrival of the missionaries in 636, their gracious reception by the king, their labours and success, and the principal events of the mission, for 144 years, or till 780. There were two persecutions, in 699 and 713. Soon after the second persecution, some new missionaries arrived. Then follows the date and erection of the monument, in 782. On the one side of this principal inscription there is a column of Chinese characters; on the other side, and at the bottom, is a Syriac inscription, in the Estrangelo character, containing catalogues of priests, deacons, and others, with a bishop, arranged in seven different classes. *Tr.*—"It should be added, that Böhlen disputes the genuineness of this record; but the alternative of supposing that the Jesuits forged a document, setting forth Nestorian doctrines and enterprise, is

too improbable to be readily adopted."—Grant's *Bampton Lectures*, 113. *S.*]

¹ See Renaudot, *l. c.* p. 51, 68, &c. *et passim*. Asseman, *l. c.* cap. ix. p. 522, &c. Theoph. Siegf. Bayer tells us (*Prafat. ad Museum Sinicum*, p. 84), that he possesses some testimonies which put the subject beyond controversy. [It is the constant tradition of the Syrian Christians, that St. Thomas the Apostle made an excursion to China, and the Christians of Malabar celebrate this event in their ordinary worship; and their primate styled himself metropolitan of India and China, when the Portuguese first knew them. See Tho. Yeates, *Indian Church Hist.* p. 71—84. See also M. de Guignes, in the *Mémoires de Littérature, tirées des Registres de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, xxx. 802, &c.: which contains a defence of the genuineness of the Sigan monument, against the objections of La Croze and Beausobre. Likewise Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xix. 291—298. *Tr.*]

² [Yet Constantinus Porphyrogenitus states (*de Administrando Imperio*, c. 31, in Banduri's *Imperium Orientale*, p. 97, ed. Paris), that the Chrobates (the Croatsians), who then inhabited Dalmatia, from which they had expelled the Avars, by order of Heraclius, made application to that emperor for religious instructors; and that he procured priests for them from Rome, who baptized them, and one of whom became their archbishop. See Semler's *Selecta Cap. Hist. Eccles.* ii. 20. Lucius, *de Regno Dalmatiae*, l. i. c. 11. Muratori, *Hist. Italia*; and Jos. Sim. Asseman, in *Calendar. Eccles. Universæ*, i. 499, &c. *Schl.*]

³ Beda, *Historia Eccles. gentis Anglor.* ii. 3, p. 91, &c. c. 14, p. 116; iii. 21, p. 162, ed. Chiflet. Rapin Thoyras, *Hist. d'Angleterre*, i. 222, &c.

Christian wives of the kings and chiefs, who employed various arts to convert their husbands; and likewise to the rigorous laws enacted against the worshippers of idols; not to mention other causes.

§ 3. Many of the Britons, Scotch, and Irish, in this century, eager to propagate the Christian religion, visited the Batavian, Belgic, and German tribes, and there founded new churches. And this it was that led the Germans afterwards to erect so many monasteries for Scots and Irishmen; some of which are still in being.¹ *Columbanus*, with a few companions, had already, in the preceding century, happily extirpated in Gaul and the contiguous regions, the ancient idolatry, the roots of which had previously struck deep everywhere; and he persevered in these labours till the year 615, in which his death is placed; and with the aid of his disciples, carried the name of the Saviour to the Swabians, Bavarians, Franks, and other nations of Germany.² *St. Gall*, one of his companions, imparted a knowledge of Christianity to the Helvetians and Swabians.³ *St. Kilian*, a Scot, converted a great many to *Christ*, among the eastern Franks.⁴

¹ See *Acta Sanctor.* Februar. ii. 362.

² Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti*, sæc. ii. p. 560, &c. t. iii. p. 72, 339, 500, and elsewhere. Adamnani, lib. iii. de S. Columbano; in Hen. Canisii *Lectiones Antiquæ*, i. 674.—[See a brief account of St. Columbanus, cent. vi. p. ii. c. ii. § 5, note. *Tr.*]

³ Walafrid Strabo, *Vita Sti Galli*; in Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedicti*, sæc. ii. p. 228 [ed. Venice, p. 215, &c.] Hen. Canisii, *Lectiones Antiquæ*, i. 783. [St. Gall, or St. Gallus, was born in Ireland, of religious parents, who early committed him to Columbanus for education. He became a monk of Bangor, under Columbanus, and was one of the twelve Irish monks who left Ireland with Columbanus about 589, travelled through England to the continent, and erected the monastery of Luxeuil in Burgundy. When Columbanus was driven from this monastery, twenty years after, St. Gall accompanied him in exile. Ascending the Rhine, they penetrated the heart of Switzerland, about 610, and took residence among pagans, at Tuggen, at the head of the lake of Zurich [or at Zug]. Attacking idolatry, St. Gall here burnt the pagan temple, and cast their offerings into the lake. This enraged the people, and the monks had to flee. Travelling through the canton of St. Gall, they came to Arbon, on the shores of the lake of Constance. Here Willimar, the presbyter of the place, treated them kindly, and aided them to form a settlement at Bregentz, at the eastern extremity of the lake. Here the monks attempted to convert the surrounding pagans, and were not without some success. But at the end of two years the unconverted procured an order from the

duke for the monks to quit the country. Columbanus and the rest now retired to Bobbio, in Italy; but St. Gall was left behind sick. When recovered, he retired into the wilderness with a few adherents, and erected the monastery of St. Gall, in the province of the same name. Here he spent the remainder of his days in great reputation and honour. He refused the bishopric of Constance, which he conferred on his pupil John. His monastery flourished much, and spread light over the surrounding country. St. Gall died at Arbon, but was interred in his monastery, at the age of ninety-five, according to Mabillon. His sermon at the ordination of John at Constance, and some epistles, are published by Canisius, *loc. cit.* His life by Walafrid Strabo, from which this notice is extracted, though full of legendary tales, is written in a far better style than the ordinary monkish biographies. It appears, according to Walafrid, that Switzerland was almost wholly pagan when first visited by Columbanus in 610; but that Christianity had then made considerable progress in Germany, from the lake of Constance all along the right bank of the Rhine. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Or Franconians. *Tr.*] *Vita S. Kiliani*, in Henr. Canisii, *Lectiones Antiquæ*, iii. 171, &c. J. Pet. de Ludewig, *Scriptores rerum Würtzburgens.* p. 966. [See also the life of St. Kilian, in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* sæc. ii. p. 951—953, ed. Venice. St. Kilian, Chilian, Cylvian, Cilian, or Kyllena, was an Irishman [Scotus], of honourable birth and good education. In early life he had a great thirst for knowledge; and being very pious, and possessing a perfect knowledge of missionary enterprises, he planned one of his own. Taking with

Near the close of the century, in the year 690, *Willibrord*, by birth an Anglo-Saxon, accompanied with eleven of his countrymen, namely, *Suulbert*, *Wigbert*, *Acca*, *Wilibald*, *Unibald*, *Lebwin*, the two *Hewalds*, *Werenfrid*, *Marcellin*, and *Adalbert*, crossed over to *Batavia*, lying opposite to Britain, with a view to convert the Frieslanders to Christianity. Then they went, in the year 692, to *Fostelandia*, which most writers suppose to be the island of *Heligoland*: being driven thence by *Radbod*, king of the Frieslanders, who put *Wigbert*, one of the company, to death, they wandered over *Cimbria* and the adjacent parts of *Denmark*. Returning to *Friesland*, in the year 693, they attacked the superstition of the country with better success. *Willibrord* was now created by the Roman pontiff, archbishop of *Willeburg*,¹ and died, at an advanced age, among the Batavians: while his associates spread a knowledge of Christianity among the Westphalians, and other neighbouring nations.²

§ 4. Upon these and other expeditions, undertaken for extending Christianity, a man strictly guided by the truth cannot speak in one unvarying tone of commendation. That some of the missionaries were men of honest simplicity and piety, no one can doubt. But most of them show manifest proofs of various sinful passions, as

him Coloman, Gallon, and Arneval, presbyters, Donatus, a deacon, and seven others, he penetrated into Franconia, which was wholly pagan, and took residence at Herbiopolis, or Würzburg. Finding their prospects good, Kilian, Coloman, and Totnan, went to Italy, to obtain the papal sanction to their enterprise; which having readily obtained from Conon (who was pope eleven months, ending Sept. 687), they returned to Würzburg, converted and baptized Gosbert, the duke, and a large number of his subjects. But afterwards, persuading the duke that it was unlawful for him to have his brother's wife, Geilana, she seized an occasional absence of her husband, and murdered all the missionaries. This cruel act is placed in 696. But the massacre did not prevent the progress of Christianity; for the duchess became deranged, the assassins repented; and St. Kilian became the tutelar saint of Würzburg. *Tr.*]

¹ [Since called Utrecht. *Tr.*]

² Aleuin, *Vita Willebrordi*, in Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* sæc. iii. p. 604, &c. [559, &c. ed. Venice.] Jo. Mölleri, *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 980, &c. [Beda, *H. E.* v. 11, 12. This famous missionary was born in Northumbria, about 659, of pious parents. Educated in the monastery of Ripon, at the age of twenty, he went to Ireland, where he studied twelve years. At the age of thirty-three he commenced his mission, and sailed up the Rhine to Utrecht, in the dominions of Radbod, the pagan king of the Frisians. Soon after he went to France, and by advice of king Pipin, visited Italy, and obtained

the sanction of pope Sergius to his enterprise. Returning to Utrecht, he in vain attempted the conversion of Radbod and his subjects. Therefore, proceeding northwards, he landed at an island called Fositeland, which was on the confines of Denmark and Friesland, and so sacred, that its fruit, its animals, and even its waters, were holy, and whoever profaned them was to be punished with death. Willibrord and his company wholly disregarded the sacredness of the place, violated the laws, were arraigned before Radbod, who cast lots on their destiny, by which one was doomed to death, and the others dismissed. They now penetrated into Denmark. On their return to the confines of France, Pipin, who in 693 had vanquished Radbod, sent Willibrord again to Italy, to be consecrated archbishop of Utrecht. Pope Sergius now gave him the name of Clement. Returning clothed with dignity, his friend Pipin aided him in his work; and for about fifty years from his leaving England he laboured, and with much success, as the apostle of the Frieslanders. He died about 740, at the age of 81. Thus far Aleuin's narrative goes. Of his followers, it is said that the two Hewalds (the *white* and the *black* Hewald), were put to death by a Saxon king, and their bodies cast into the Rhine; that Suibert preached to the Bructeri near Cologne, and at last at Kaiserswerth on the Rhine, where he died A.D. 713; that Willibald became bishop of Eichstadt in Bavaria; and Marcellinus, bishop of the country along the Issel. *Tr.*]

arrogance, avarice, and cruelty; and having received authority from the Roman pontiff to exercise their sacred functions among the barbarians, they did not so much collect holy congregations of devout Christians, as procure for themselves a people, among whom they might act the part of sovereigns and lords. I cannot, therefore, strongly censure those who suspect that some of these monks, being desirous of ruling, concealed for a time their vicious propensities under the veil of religion, and imposed upon themselves various hardships, that they might acquire the rank and honours of bishops and archbishops.

§ 5. Of the Jews, very few, if any, voluntarily embraced Christianity. But the Christians compelled many of them, in different places, by means of penalties, to make an outward profession of belief in *Christ*. The emperor *Heraclius*, being incensed against them, as is reported, by the influence of Christian doctors, made havoc of the miserable nation; and ordered vast numbers of them to be dragged reluctantly to baptism.¹ The kings of Spain and Gaul had no hesitation to do the same, although even the Roman pontiffs were indignant.² Such were the evils that resulted from ignorance of true Christian principles, and from the age's barbarism.

CHAPTER II.

THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND.*

§ 1. Augustine despatched on a mission into England—§ 2. Its partial failure—§ 3. Christianity established in Kent—§ 4. Conversion of Northumbria, and eventual triumph of the Roman party—§ 5. Conversion of Mercia—§ 6. Conversion of Essex—§ 7. Conversion of East Anglia—§ 8. Conversion of Wessex—§ 9. Conversion of Sussex.

§ 1. THE importance of England, from political power, extension of language, literary eminence, and primitive ecclesiastical polity, demands a particular account of her conversion, by way of supplement to notices of the prosperous events of the seventh century. The known history of her Christian profession begins, indeed, at the close of the preceding age, when Augustine, the Roman monk, obtained a permanent footing in Kent.³ This devoted and indefatigable missionary had been prior of the monastery of St. Andrew, at Rome. Gregory I., or the Great, then pope, had meditated a mission into England, during several years, and being unable to undertake it in person, he selected

¹ Eutychius, *Annales Ecclesiæ Alexandr.* t. ii. 212, &c.

² [See some authorities on this subject, quoted by Baronius, *Annales Eccles.* ad. ann. 614, sub fin. t. viii. 239, &c. *Tr.*]

* SOAMES.

³ Augustine's commission from the pope is dated 596, his arrival in Kent, 597. Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, i. 89.

Augustine for the honourable enterprise. There were several reasons obviously encouraging expectation of success. Britain had been converted early, though the precise period is unascertainable, and a flourishing church had been found there by the pagan Saxons. Under the weight of their long hostilities, and heathen zeal, it had necessarily fallen; but still the Christian Britons were not extinct. They remained unsubdued in Wales, and in the furthest portions of Western England. Probably they remained also intermingled with their Saxon conquerors, through every district of South Britain. But Gregory chiefly calculated upon success, from a favourable opening at the Kentish court. Ethelbert, king of Kent, the *Bretwalda*, or admitted chief among the Anglo-Saxon monarchs of his day, had espoused Bertha, daughter of Cherebert, king of Paris, on condition of allowing her to continue in the profession of Christianity. She, probably, soon undermined the pagan prejudices of her husband.¹ Augustine, accordingly, seems to have found little difficulty in converting Ethelbert, and in giving a Christian face to the petty kingdom of Kent.

§ 2. But his views took a much wider range, though not entirely from missionary zeal. His employer, Gregory, was anxious to organise a British church, strictly conformable to that of Rome. He did not, indeed, wish to force the Roman ritual upon the insular Christians. Augustine had his express permission to use any other that might seem more eligible.² The missionary was, however, meant for primate of Britain,³ and all the island was to be rendered conformable with Roman usages. Now these objects were obviously of no easy attainment. The Welsh and West of England Britons had bishops of their own, [retained the ancient method of computing Easter, in ignorance of the newer one now in use,] and varied in some other particulars from the religious habits of Rome.⁴ Augustine had sufficient influence to obtain two conferences with their prelacy, and some others, to represent their opinions, upon the borders of Worcestershire. But disappointment closed both interviews. Exception was taken to his haughty manners; and the Britons had evidently no thought of surrendering their independence or peculiarities. At his death, which appears to have happened shortly after, Augustine had

¹ Gregory writes to her that she *ought* to have done so. (Ep. ix. 59.) He probably knew that she *had* done so.

² Bed. *H. E.* i. 27.

³ Whether this was formally proposed to the British Christians, does not appear. They were, however, aware of Augustine's claim, and peremptorily repelled it: *Neque illum pro archiepiscopo habituros esse respondebant.* Bede, *H. E.* ii. 2.

⁴ "There are many traces of a connexion having existed between the Christians in that part of the world" (the south of France) "and those of Asia Minor. It has been supposed that Polycarp sent missionaries

into Gaul." Burton's *Hist. of the Christ. Ch.* Lond. 1838, p. 237. [The arguments that have been used to prove the independent Oriental origin of the British church from the Paschal computation and semicircular tonsure, vanish before careful criticism. The usage on both these points differed as much from that of the Eastern as from that of the Western churches. For the former, they followed the ancient use of Rome, and the latter practice may have been indigenous, though it was ascribed to Simon Magus by its opponents, and to St. John by the Britons themselves. *Ed.*]

effected little more than the organisation of a church in Kent, in communion with that of Rome.¹

§ 3. Even this contracted establishment soon appeared on the very verge of extinction. Ethelbert, in declining age, lost Bertha, his Christian wife, and then espoused a younger female. When he died himself, his own son, Eadbald, married the widow, and eluded Christian objections to such indecency, by relapsing into paganism. Laurentius, who succeeded Augustine in the see of Canterbury, not only found expostulation hopeless, but also saw very little prospect of retaining any hold upon the Kentish population. He therefore made preparations for a withdrawal to the continent. When all was ready, he tried a last experiment upon the semi-savage prince, by submitting to such a flagellation, as left marks upon his shoulders. These he exhibited to the king of Kent, assuring him that the chastisement had come from no meaner hand than that of St. Peter himself, who had, last night, thus added pungency to severe animadversions upon his proposed dereliction of duty. His hearer was no match for this. He relinquished his incestuous connexion, became a Christian again, and saved the Kentish church.²

§ 4. A sister of his, named Ethelburga, or Tate, was married to Edwin, king of Northumbria, and went into the north, as her mother, Bertha, did into Kent, under an express stipulation of allowance in the profession of Christianity.³ By her influence, aided by the dexterity of Paulinus, her principal chaplain, the prince and court of Northumbria became Christian; an example which was imitated extensively by the population.⁴ A successful pagan invasion, however, drove Ethelburga with Paulinus back into Kent, and gave to the country its former heathen appearance.⁵ Its final adoption of Christianity flowed from the exertions of Oswald, one of the old royal family, who had been educated in Scotland, among members of the ancient British church.⁶ He sent into that country for some one to conduct a mission, and Aidan, a distinguished monk of Iona, answered the summons. For him an episcopal see was founded at Lindisfarne, and his high character was fully maintained in Northumbria. It was under this bishop and his two admirable successors, Finan and Colman, that the north of England was converted to Christianity. All the three were not only unconnected with Rome, but also at variance with her about Easter and other matters. Her influence in that portion of the island was finally established at the council or conference of Whitby, in 664. This was convened by means of Oswy, king of Northumbria, who had married Eanfleda, daughter of Edwin and Ethelburga, but educated in Kent, and immoveably attached to the Roman usages. Oswy's education had been among the adherents of

¹ [Augustine's death may be fixed in 604 or 605. Wharton argues convincingly for 604. *Ed.*]

² Bed. ii. 6. [The story has an air of fable. See Hook, *Archbishops of Cant.* vol. i. c. ii. *Ed.*]

³ Bede, ii. 9.

⁴ Paulinus was said to have once spent thirty-six days in catechizing and baptizing upon one of the royal domains. The king and queen were with him. Bede, ii. 14.

⁵ Ib. ii. 20.

⁶ Ib. iii. 3.

the ancient British church, in his native Northumbria, and he long withstood his wife's example; probably, also, her importunities. At length he seems to have been wearied out with opposition, and anxious only for an opening through which he could decently give way. On hearing, accordingly, at Whitby, that St. Peter, who keeps the keys of heaven, commanded the Roman Easter, Oswy said that he must not disobey him, for fear of having the door shut when he should require admittance.¹

§ 5. Still more free than even Northumbria from obligations to Roman missionary zeal, was the great kingdom of Mercia, or all the centre of England. Its king, Peada, sought a wife from the court of his northern neighbour. But the Northumbrian family would only receive such a proposal, on condition of the suitor's conversion to Christianity. These terms being accepted, Peada renounced paganism, and admitted a prelate from Northumbria, as the religious head of his people.² The next three bishops of Mercia were all members of the ancient British church, and the whole middle of England was thus planted with a Christian population, by means of missionaries in actual opposition to Rome.

§ 6. To the ancient British church also did the kingdom of Essex really owe its conversion. This district had nominally become Christian by means of Ethelbert, the Kentish sovereign, whose name has become so famous from its connexion with Augustine. But the prospect of an escape from paganism then proved no more than a deceitful gleam. Ethelbert's influence having ceased at his death, Essex immediately relapsed into its former heathenism. It was not until Sigebert, a subsequent sovereign of the country, had been converted at the Northumbrian court, that this portion of England, eventually distinguished as the site of London, was rendered permanently Christian.³ Thus Northumbria, the religious pupil of anti-Roman Scotland [and Ireland], again stepped forward as the successful enemy of Anglo-Saxon paganism. Rome had tried in vain. The Gospel's triumph was reserved for native zeal.

§ 7. The counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, then forming the kingdom of East Anglia, found their most zealous and effective missionary in Fursey, an Irish monk.⁴ Ireland long remained free from papal influence; and records illustrative of her ancient religion, prove its general coincidence with the Protestantism of later times.⁵ Fursey's evangelical labours in East Anglia, therefore, connect the conversion of that country rather with a native mission, than with that which Gregory planned.

§ 8. To the south of the Thames, Anglo-Saxon Christianity chiefly came from Rome. Not only was it entirely so with Kent, but in

¹ Bede, iii. 25.

² Ib. iii. 21.

³ Ib. iii. 22.

⁴ Fursey appears to have arrived in England about 633, to have gone over into France in 648, and to have died at Mazières, in Ponthieu, in 650. Note to Smith's *Bede*, iii. 19.

⁵ See Abp. Ussher's *Discourse of the Religion anciently professed by the Irish and British*; republished, with the archbishop's *Answer to a Jesuit*, and other tracts on popery, by the University of Cambridge, in 8vo. in 1835.

Wessex, likewise, eventually the dominant kingdom, Birinus, a Roman monk, instigated by Pope Honorius, was the leading instrument in evangelizing the people. But even this missionary's success appears to have been greatly facilitated by Northumbrian influence. While Birinus struggled for a footing, Oswald, the zealous Christian king of Northern England, but a member of the ancient [Celtic] church, was in Wessex for the purpose of marrying into the royal family there. He did not leave the country until he saw his father-in-law, and his bride, both members of the Christian church. To the former he stood sponsor at baptism,¹ and it is hardly doubtful that his favourable interference was highly useful to Birinus. Thus, although the mission was Roman, a power at variance with Rome seems to have been its principal dependence. Nor did Northumbrian interest in the evangelization of Wessex cease with Oswald. Oswy, who succeeded him, persuaded Agilbert, a French monk, to preach the Gospel in that country.² This missionary had spent no small time in Ireland reading Scripture.³

§ 9. Sussex may be considered as a Roman conversion.⁴ The successful missionary was not, indeed, sent from Rome; but it was no other than Wilfrid, a native Saxon, famed for appeals to the pope, and an ardent papal partisan through life.⁵ Thus two Anglo-Saxon kingdoms only, and those the least, Kent and Sussex, were converted entirely without aid from the ancient church of Britain. All the rest of England was, more or less, indebted for Christianity to [Celtic] zeal. The northern and middle regions had hardly anything even of assistance from Rome; the evangelists of those extensive districts being in active opposition to her pontiffs and peculiarities. [But although the work of the conversion was divided between Irish, Scotch, French, Italian, and Burgundian missionaries, the church of England owes its consolidation and thorough organization to Theodore of Tarsus, an oriental monk, who was appointed archbishop of Canterbury by Pope Vitalian in 668. In his services we recognise our debt to both the Eastern and Western churches.]

¹ Bed. iii. 7. The conversion of Wessex is referred to 635.

² Rudbourn, *Hist. Maj. Winton.* apud Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, i. 192.

³ Bed. iii. 7.

⁴ [Between 681 and 685. *Ed.*]

⁵ For the case of Wilfred and his appeals, the reader is referred to Mr. Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, 82, 89. Romish writers represent him as an authority for appeals to Rome from ancient England. He certainly is an instance of such; but it appears that his countrymen disregarded them. His case really, therefore, makes against the establishment of papal authority over England. He lived, indeed, when Italian dexterity was

only beginning to triumph over the rudeness of ancient Britain. The supplanted party, though humbled, must have continued obstinate and numerous during all his life. His own applications to Rome were evidently mere experiments dictated by existing difficulties. To say nothing of his own identification with the Roman party, the ancient capital of Europe contained such canonists, and other sources of information, as were to be found nowhere else in the West. He might, therefore, plead, that a decision in his favour from a quarter so trustworthy, was entitled to a degree of deference that no domestic authority could challenge.

CHAPTER III.

ADVERSITIES OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Persecutions of the Christians—§ 2. Mahumed—§ 3. Judgment concerning him—§ 4. Causes of the rapid progress of his religion—§ 5. Disposition of the Mahumeds towards the Christians—§ 6. Sects among them.

§ 1. THE Christians suffered less in this, than in the preceding centuries. By the Persian kings, they were at times persecuted; but the rage against them soon subsided. In England, some of the petty kings oppressed the new converts to Christianity: but soon after, these kings themselves became professed Christians. In the East, especially in Syria and Palestine, the Jews sometimes rose upon the Christians with great violence;¹ yet so unsuccessfully, as to suffer severely for their temerity. Those living among the Christians, who secretly consulted about restoring the pagan religion, were too weak to venture on any positive measures.

§ 2. But a new and most powerful adversary of Christianity started up in *Arabia*, A. D. 612, in the reign of *Heraclius*. This was *Mahumed*, an illiterate man,² indeed, but of noble birth, naturally eloquent, and possessing great acuteness of mind.³ He proclaimed that he was sent from God, not only to overthrow polytheism, but also to purge and reform the religions, first, of the Arabs, then those of the Jews and Christians. He now framed a new law, which is called the *Koran*,⁴

¹ Eutychius, *Annales*, ii. 236, &c. Jo. Hen. Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, l. i. c. iii. p. 129, &c.

² Mahumed himself professed to be destitute of science and learning, and even to be unable to read and write: and his followers have deduced from this ignorance of his, an argument for the divinity of the religion which he taught. But it is hardly credible that he was so rude and ignorant a man. And there are some among his adherents who question the reality of the fact. See Jo. Chardin, *Voyages en Perse*, iv. 33, 34. Indeed when I consider that Mahumed, for a long time, pursued a gainful commerce in Arabia and the adjacent countries, I think that he must have been able to read, and write, and cast accounts; for merchants cannot dispense with this degree of knowledge.

³ The writers on his life and religion are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Delectus et Syllabus Argumentor. pro veritate religionis Christianæ*, cap. l. p. 733, &c. To

which may be added count Boulanvilliers, *Vie de Mahomet*, Lond. 1730, 8vo. which, however, is rather a romance than a history. Jo. Gagnier, *Vie de Mahomet*, 2 vols. 12mo. Amsterd. 1732, is commendable for the ingenuousness of the author, yet the style is dry. George Sale, a distinguished and very judicious author, in his preliminary discourse, prefixed to his version of the *Koran*, sec. ii. [p. 45, &c. ed. Lond. 1825. H. Prideaux, *Life of Mahomet*, 1697, 8vo. Abulfeda, *Annales Muslem.* Ar. and Lat. 2 vols. 4to. Hafniae, 1790. Abulfeda, *de Vita et Rebus Gestis Mohammedis*, Arab. and Lat. Oxon. 1723. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xix. 327—405. Tr.]

⁴ For an account of the *Koran*, see in preference to all others, Geo. Sale, Preliminary Discourse, prefixed to his English version of that book. Add Vertot, *Discours sur l'Alcoran*; annexed to the third volume of his *History of the Knights of Malta*, in French. Jo. Chardin, *Voyages en Perse*, ii. 281, new ed. The book which the Mahume-

and after gaining some victories over his enemies, he compelled an immense multitude of persons, first in Arabia, and then in the neighbouring countries, to assent to his doctrines. Elated with this unexpected success, he even began to think of founding an empire; and he effected his object with no less success than boldness; so that, at his death, he saw himself the sovereign of all Arabia, and of some neighbouring countries.

§ 3. No one can, at this day, form a perfect judgment of the entire character, views, and designs of *Mahumed*. For we cannot safely rely on the Greek writers, who made no hesitation to load their enemy with slanders and falsehoods; nor can we trust to the Arabians, the very worst of historians, who conceal his vices and crimes, and pretend that nothing ever was more divine than he. Besides, a very considerable part of his life, and that, too, from which the motives and secret springs of his conduct would best appear, lies concealed from us. It is very probable, however, that abhorrence of the superstition, in which he saw his countrymen involved, so wrought upon him as to throw him into a disordered state of mind; and that he really believed himself divinely commissioned to reform the religion of the Arabs, and reinstate among them the worship of the one true God. But it is also certain, that afterwards, when he saw his attempt answer to his wishes, he deluded the fickle, credulous multitude with impious tricks and impostures, in order to strengthen his cause; and even feigned

dans called the *Koran*, is a collection of papers and discourses discovered and published after the death of Mahumed; and is not that *Law* which he so highly extolled. Perhaps some parts of the true *Koran* are still found in the modern *Koran*: but that the *Koran* or *Law*, which Mahumed prescribed to the Arabians, differed from the present *Koran*, is manifest from the fact, that Mahumed in our *Koran* appeals to and extols that other true *Koran*. A book which is commended and extolled in any writing, must certainly be different from that in which it is commended. May we not conjecture, that the true *Koran* was an *Arabie poem*, which Mahumed recited to his adherents, and wished them to commit to memory, but which he did not write out? Such, it is well known, were the laws of the Gallic Druids; and such is said to be that Indian law, which the Brahmins learn and preserve in their memories. [These conjectures of Mosheim appear wholly without foundation. There is no reason to believe there ever was a *Koran* essentially different from that which we now have; or that Mahumed declined committing his pretended revelations to writing. The only argument adduced by Mosheim is of no force at all, considering the manner in which the *Koran* came into existence. The book itself professes to have been composed by God, in the highest heavens; and thence sent down

to the lower heavens by the angel Gabriel, who communicated it, by parcels, to Mahumed, during the twenty-three years that he claimed to be a prophet. Moreover, the parcels revealed last, often revoked or modified what had been revealed before; and likewise replied to the objections of infidels against the book. See Sale's *Koran*, vol. i. ed. Lond. 1825, ch. vi. p. 159, and vol. ii. ch. x. p. 31, ch. xvi. p. 107, ch. xxv. p. 213, ch. xevii. p. 497. The Mahumedan doctors say, the *Koran* existed, together with the decrees of God, from all eternity, engraven on a table of stone, hard by the throne of God, and called the *preserved table*; that God sent the angel Gabriel, with a transcript of the entire *Koran*, down to the lowest heavens, where, during twenty-three years, he revealed it by parcels to Mahumed; that Mahumed caused these parcels to be written down by his scribe, as they were received, and published them at once to his followers, some of whom took copies, while the greater part got them by heart; that the original MSS. of the scribe, when returned, were thrown promiscuously into a chest, whence they were taken, after the prophet's death, and published collectively, in their present form and order, which is wholly without regard to dates, or a classification of subjects. See Sale's *Prelim. Discourse*, sec. iii. p. 77—95. *Tr.*]

divine revelations, whenever occasion seemed to require it, or any great difficulty occurred. Nor is this inconsistent with a character of fanaticism; for most fanatics think deception, so far as seems necessary to their designs, to be holy and approved of God; and they of course resort to deception, when they can do it safely.¹ The religion which he inculcated is not what it would have been, if his designs had not been opposed. The pertinacity with which the Arabians adhered to the opinions and customs of their ancestors, and the hope of gaining over the Jews and Christians to his cause, undoubtedly led him to approve and tolerate many things, which he would have rejected and abrogated, if he had been at liberty to do exactly as he would.

§ 4. The causes of the rapid progress of this new religion among so many nations, are not difficult to be discovered. In the first place, the terror of arms, which *Mahumed* and his successors carried with great success into different countries, compelled vast multitudes to receive his law. In the next place, his law itself was admirably adapted to the natural dispositions of men, but especially to the manners, opinions, and vices prevalent among the people of the East: for it was extremely simple, proposing very few things to be believed; nor did it enjoin many and difficult duties to be performed, or such as laid severe restraints on the propensities of men.² Moreover, the consummate ignorance, which characterised, for the most part, the Arabians, Syrians, Persians, and other nations of the East, gave a bold and eloquent man ready access to the minds of immense numbers. We may add, that the virulent contests among the Christian Greeks, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Monophysites, which filled a large part of the East with carnage and horrible crimes, rendered their religion odious in the eyes of many. Besides all this, the Monophysites and Nestorians themselves, whom the Greeks oppressed most grievously, rendered assistance to the Arabians, and thus facilitated their conquest of some provinces.³ Other causes will suggest themselves to those who consider attentively the state of the world, and the character of the Mahumedan religion.

§ 5. After the death of *Mahumed*, in the year 632, his followers issued forth from Arabia, with their native fortitude stimulated by a furious fanaticism, and aided, as has been already observed, by those Christians who were persecuted by the Greeks, extended their conquests over Syria, Persia, Egypt, and some other countries.⁴ Nor

¹ This, in my judgment, is the best way of deciding the controversy, which has been agitated by learned men of our age; whether Mahumed was a fanatic, or an impostor? See Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique*, t. iii. artic. *Mahomet*, note (k). Sim. Ockley, *Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt, by the Saracens*, i. 68, Lond. 1708, 8vo. George Sale, *Preliminary Discourse* to his translation of the Koran, sec. ii. [p. 53, &c. ed. Lond. 1825. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xix. 380, &c. Tr. Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Lect. viii. Ed.]

² See Hadr. Reland, *de Religione Mahumetica*, libri ii. Utrecht, 1717, 12mo. Geo. Sale, *Prelim. Dissert. to the Koran*, sec. iv. v. vi. [Han. Moore, *Dictionary of all Religions*, art. *Mahometans*, ed. 1817. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xix. 356, &c. Tr.]

³ See Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 163, 169 [and Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, &c., c. li., where this is shown by the conduct of the Copts, or Jacobites in Egypt. Tr.]

⁴ See Simon Ockley, *Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt, by the Saracens*, vol. i.

could the Greeks, harassed with intestine commotions and various wars, put forth *sufficient* energy to check their rapid career. The victors, at first, used their prosperity with moderation; and were very indulgent towards the Christians, especially to those who opposed the decrees of Ephesus and Chalcedon. But, as is common in cases where everything succeeds, they insensibly swerved from this moderation into severity, and so loaded the Christians with taxes and other burdens and injuries, that their condition more resembled that of slaves than that of citizens.

§ 6. The civil dissensions among the Mahumedans, which arose soon after the death of their prophet, were not a little injurious to the success of their enterprises. *Abubeker*, the father-in-law, and *Ali*, the son-in-law, of *Mahumed*, engaged in a severe struggle about the right to the throne, which each claimed for himself; and this controversy being handed down to posterity, divided the whole race into two great parties, separated not only by a difference in opinions and practices, but also by deadly hatred. The two sects are called, the one *Sonnites*, and the other *Shiites*.¹ The former contend, that *Abubeker* was the true *Kalif*; the latter, that *Ali* was the legitimate successor of *Mahumed*. Both regard the *Koran* as of divine origin, and the authoritative rule in religion; but the *Sonnites* unite with it the *Sonna*, a sort of oral law, derived from *Mahumed*, and serving to explain the *Koran*; which the *Shiites* wholly discard. The Turks, Tartars, Africans, and most of the Indians, are *Sonnites*; the Persians and Mogores are *Shiites*; yet the Mogores seem to belong to neither sect.² Besides these two grand divisions, there are among the Mahumedans four principal sects, and a great many subordinate ones; which contend sharply respecting various subjects in religion, yet practise mutual toleration.³

Lond. 1708, and vol. ii. Lond. 1717, 8vo. [also Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, &c., ch. l. li. *Tr.*]

¹ See Adr. Reland, *de Religione Turcica*, lib. i. p. 36, 70, 74, 85. Joh. Chardin, *Voyages en Perse*, ii. 236, &c.

² The principles of the *Sonnites* may be learned from the tract published by Adr. Reland, *de Relig. Turcica*, lib. i. The reli-

gion and opinions of the *Shiites* are clearly stated by John Chardin, *Voyages en Perse*, t. iv. the whole.

³ On the Mahumedan sects, see Jo. Henr. Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 340. Ricaut, *Etat de l'Empire Ottoman*, l. ii. p. 242. Jo. Chardin, *Voyages en Perse*, ii. 236. Geo. Sale, *Preliminary Discourse to the Koran*, sec. viii. p. 207, &c.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of learning. The monks its patrons — § 2. Ignorance of the bishops —
 § 3. History and other sciences corrupted — § 4. State of philosophy.

§ 1. THE profound ignorance and barbarism of this century will hardly appear credible to those who have not themselves inspected the monuments which remain of it. What little of learning and wisdom still remained, with a few exceptions, was confined to the cloisters of the monks, especially among the Latins. The laws forbade any one to be made an *abbot*, unless he had some learning. The monks themselves were enjoined to employ certain hours in reading; and that they might derive greater profit from this exercise, they were required, in most monasteries, to converse and debate together, at stated times, on the subjects which they had read.¹ It was their business also to educate young men destined for the sacred office. But all the institutions of this sort were of little service to the cause of learning and to the church; because very few had any just conception of the ends and nature of the liberal arts and sciences; and most of them were more intent on the perusal of worthless writers, and the lives of saints, than on the study of valuable authors. Those who did best, were assiduous in perusing the works of *Augustine* and *Gregory* the Great; and scraps gathered from these fathers constituted the best productions of the Latin church in this century.

§ 2. Kings and noblemen were attentive to everything, rather than to the cause of learning. The rude and unlearned bishops suffered the schools, which had been committed to their care, to languish and become extinct.² It was very rare to find among them such as could compose their own public discourses. Those who possessed some genius among them, strung together from *Augustine* and *Gregory* a parcel of jejune addresses; a part of which they kept

¹ Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* ii. 479, 513, *et passim*.

² *Hist. Litt. de la France, par Des Moines Bénédict.* Sept. Siècle, iii. 428, &c.

for their own use, and the rest they imparted to their more dull and stupid colleagues, that *they* might have something fit for bringing forward. This is manifest from the examples of *Casarius* of Arles, and of *Eligius* of Noyon. There is extant also a Summary of Theology, unskilfully compiled by *Tajo*, bishop of Saragossa, from the writings of *Augustine* and *Gregory*: and this insipid performance was so highly esteemed, that the other bishops did not hesitate to pronounce the author of it *the true salt of the earth*, and a *divine luminary* in the church.¹ Many such proofs of the ignorance of the times may be easily collected by one acquainted with the writers of this century. England, however, was in a happier state, in this respect, than the other countries of Europe; for *Theodore*, a Cilician, who held the see of Canterbury, of whom more will be said hereafter, introduced into that country some attachment to letters and learning.²

§ 3. The Greeks who attempted to write, either in poetry or prose, obscured plain and simple subjects by an inflated and tumid phraseology. The style of the Latins, with very few exceptions, was so base and corrupt, that it cannot even be commended for this perversion of taste. History was wretchedly abused, both by Greeks and Latins. Among the former *Moschus*, *Sophronius*, with others, among the latter, *Braulio*, *Jonas* an Hibernian, *Audoenus*, *Dado*, and *Adamannus*, have left us biographies of several saints, but such as are insipid and ridiculous, and have neither the light of truth, nor any seasoning of language. The Greeks led the way in committing to writing indiscriminately whatever tales were current among the vulgar about ancient times, and hence came those numerous medleys of fables, which the Latins afterwards drank in with greedy ears and minds.

§ 4. Philosophy, among the Latins, was at an end. Those who were unwilling to neglect it altogether, were satisfied with committing to memory a few words and sentences, taken from *Boëthius* and *Cassiodorus*. For they were neither willing to reason for themselves, nor able to consult the Greeks, from ignorance of their language. The Greeks, abandoning *Plato* to certain of the monks, betook themselves to *Aristotle*, whose precepts were nearly indispensable, in the theological contests of the age, with the Monophysites, Nestorians, and Monothelites: for all these resorted to the Stagirite for aid whenever they were called to the combat. Hence *James* of Edessa, a Monophysite of this century, translated Aristotle's *Dialectics* into Syriac.³

¹ Jo. Mabillon, *Analecta Veteris Ævi*, ii. 77.

² Dav. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, i. 42. Herm. Conringius, *Antiquitates Academicæ*, p. 277.

³ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vaticanæ*, i. 498. [It is impossible to read this and several of the corresponding chapters in the centuries v-viii, without sus-

pecting that the author had not devoted to these ages the same attention that he has given to the earlier and later ones. The chapters on Missionary work are liable to the same suspicion. There is very much prejudice, and the appeals to authorities are few and of little value. *Ed.*]

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Disputes about pre-eminence, between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople —
 § 2. The former opposed by many — § 3. Vices of the clergy — § 4. State of the monks
 — § 5. Greek writers — § 6. Latin writers.

§ 1. THE contest for pre-eminence between the Roman and Constantinopolitan prelates had gained such a height in this century, that we may clearly discern the commencement of that unhappy schism which afterwards separated the Latins from the Greeks. It is commonly asserted, by men of the greatest learning, and best acquainted with ancient history, that the Roman pontiff, *Boniface III.*, prevailed on that abominable tyrant, *Phocas*, who mounted the imperial throne, after murdering the emperor *Mauricius*, to divest the bishop of Constantinople of the title of *œcumenical bishop*, and to confer it on the Roman pontiff. But this is stated solely on the authority of *Baronius*;¹ for no ancient writer has given such testimony. Yet *Phocas* did something akin to this, if we may believe *Anastasius*, and *Paul the Deacon*.² For whereas the bishops of Constantinople had maintained, that their church was not only fully equal to that of Rome, but also had precedence of all other churches, *Phocas* forbade this, and determined that the priority of rank and dignity should be given to the church of Rome.

§ 2. The Roman pontiffs used indeed every means to maintain and enlarge the power and dignity which they had obtained: yet the history of this period affords many proofs, not only that emperors and kings, but that nations also, resisted those attempts. Many indications of the existence of the regal power in religious matters,

¹ [*Baronius, Annales*, ad ann. 606, No. 2. *Schl.*]

² *Anastasius, de Vitis Pontificum* (*Bonifacius III.*). *Paulus Diaconus, de Rebus gestis Longobardor.* lib. iv. cap. 37, in *Muratorii, Scriptores Rerum Italianar.* t. i. pt. i. p. 465. [*Anastasius* says, that “whereas the church of Constantinople had claimed to be the first of all the churches, *Boniface* obtained from the emperor *Phocas*, that the Roman church, the apostolic seat of the blessed apostle *Peter* (*caput esset omnium ecclesiarum*), should be the head of all the churches.” *Paul Diaconus* says: — “This emperor, *Phocas*, at the request of pope

Boniface, decreed that the see of the Roman and apostolic church should be the first (*primam esse*), whereas the Constantinopolitan had before assumed to be the first of all.” — By being the first and the head, both the bishops of Constantinople, and the usurper *Phocas*, seem to have understood merely priority of rank, and not that supreme authority and dominion which the Roman pontiffs afterwards claimed. It was intended as a compliment; but it was construed into a grant of unlimited power. See *Bower's Lives of the Popes* (*Boniface III.*), ii. 545, &c. *Tr.*]

and even over the pontiff himself, may be collected from the Byzantine history, and from the *Formulas of Marculfus*. The Roman writers tell us, that *Constantine Pogonatus* formally relinquished the right of confirming the election of a Roman pontiff: and they cite *Anastasius* as a witness; who states, that *Pogonatus* ordered, that a Roman pontiff elect should be ordained forthwith and without delay.¹ But this testimony does not reach the point to be proved. It appears, however, to have been the fact, that this emperor, in the time of the pontiff *Agatho*, remitted the customary payment to the court of a sum of money for the confirmation of a pontifical election.² The ancient Britons and Scots could not be moved for a long time, either by the threats or the promises of the papal legates, to subject themselves to the Roman decrees and laws; as is abundantly testified by *Bede*.³ The Gauls and the Spaniards, as no one can deny, attributed just so much authority to the pontiff, as they thought likely to make for their own advantage.⁴ Nor in Italy itself could he make the bishop of Ravenna, and others, bow obsequiously to his will.⁵ And of private individuals, there were many who expressed openly their detestation of his vices and his greediness of power. Nor are those destitute of arguments, who assert that the Waldenses, even in this age, had fixed their residence in the valleys of Piedmont, and inveighed freely against Roman domination.⁶

¹ *Anastasius, de Vitis Pontif.* (Benedict), in Muratori, *Scriptor. Rerum Italic.* iii. 146. [The words of Anastasius are, *concessit, ut persona, quæ electa fuerit in sedem Apostolicam, e vestigio absque tarditate Pontifex ordinaretur*. That is, it should not be necessary to write to Constantinople, but merely to obtain liberty from the emperor's vicergerent, the exarch of Ravenna, previously to the ordination. Moreover, history shows, that succeeding emperors did not respect this privilege. *Schl.*]

² *Anastasius, de Vitis Pontif.* (Agatho), p. 144. Compare Jo. Ja. Mascov. *Historia Germanor.* t. ii. note, p. 121, &c. [According to Anastasius, the emperor did not wholly remit, but only diminished the amount of the payment; "*relevata est quantitas, quæ solita est dari*;" and this too with the express injunction that the ancient rule should be observed, and no ordination take place till the consent of the emperor should be obtained from court. See Bower's *Lives of the Popes* (Agatho), iii. 131, &c. *Tr.*]

³ [Bede, *H. E.* ii. 2, iii. 25. *Schl.*—The case of Wilfrid, bishop of York, who, being deposed and banished by the Saxon king in 678, appealed to Rome, and returned acquitted, but was imprisoned nine months, and then banished the kingdom, is a strong case in point. See Bower's *Lives of the Popes* (Agatho), iii. 98—105. *Tr.*]

⁴ [It is well known, that the French kings often deposed bishops, whom the popes, by

all their efforts, were not able to restore; and that in Spain, Julian, the bishop of Toledo, freely censured pope Benedict II. for sending into Spain his disapprobation of a synodic letter; and accused his holiness of ignorance, negligence, and jealousy. Yet this Julian is a canonised saint. See the fifteenth council of Toledo, in Harduin, *Concil.* iii. 1761, &c. *Schl.*]

⁵ Mich. Geddes, *Miscellaneous Tracts*, ii. 6, &c. [and Muratori, *Hist. of Italy*, iv. 157; where is a diploma of the emperor Constantine IV. in which he releases Maurus, archbishop of Ravenna, from obedience to the pope. At his death, this archbishop warned his clergy not to subject themselves to the Roman pontiff, but to apply to the emperor for a pall for the new archbishop. And to the present time, the archbishops claim a kind of independence of the Roman see. Even the abbot, St. Columbanus, defends the ancient Irish manner of keeping Easter, against the popes, with great intrepidity; and likewise the subject of the three chapters; and this, at the instigation of king Agilulph. He maintains, that Vigilius was not watchful enough, and that the pope ought to purge the seat of St. Peter from all errors, from which it was not now free. See his five Epistles, in the *Biblioth. Max. Patr.* Lugd. xii. 1, &c. *Schl.*]

⁶ Anton. Leger, *Hist. des Eglises Vau-doises*, l. i. p. 15, &c. [and Spanheim, *Introduct. Plen.* ii. 598, &c. *Schl.*—The

§ 3. That the bishops of inferior rank, and all who were intrusted with sacred offices, as well those in the monasteries as those without, lived in the practice of many enormities is expressly admitted by every writer of any note in this century. Everywhere simony, avarice, pious frauds, intolerable pride, insolence to the people at large, and even vices worse than these might be seen reigning in the places consecrated to holiness and virtue.¹ Between the monks and the bishops, many pertinacious quarrels existed in different places. For the latter laid their greedy hands on the rich possessions of the monks, that they might support their own luxury. And the monks, feeling this very sensibly, first applied to the emperors and kings; but not finding *their* protection adequate, resorted to the Roman pontiff.² He therefore readily took them under his care, and gradually exempted them from the jurisdiction of the bishops. The monks, in return, defended the interest of the pontiff, as if it were their own; and they recommended him as a sort of God to the ignorant multitude, over whom their reputed sanctity gave them great influence. That these *exemptions* of the monks gave occasion to many of their vices and disorders, is admitted by most of the best writers.³

§ 4. In the meantime the monks, from the favour of the pontiff, and their display of a fictitious piety, were everywhere making surprising progress, especially among the Latins. Parents eagerly consecrated their children to God in the monasteries, not without a dowry; that is, they devoted them to what was esteemed the highest bliss on earth,—a life of solitude.⁴ Those who had spent their lives in guilty deeds, hoped to expiate their crimes by conferring the greater part of their property on some society of monks. And immense numbers, impelled by superstition, robbed their heirs of their richest possessions, in order to render God pro-

Waldenses derived their name from Peter Waldo (1150—1200), and there is no authority for their existence before that date. Cf. Gieseler, iii. 411. *Ed.*]

¹ [Thus, Desiderius, a nobleman, assumed the garb of a beggar, and conducted Brunchild, who was expelled the court of Theodebert, in safety to the court of Burgundy. At her solicitation, her faithful conductor was advanced to the bishopric of Auxerre (Daniel, *History of France*, i. 351, of the German translation). To the *simony* of the clergy, the national synod of Toledo, A.D. 653, Can. 3, bears testimony; to their *avarice*, the provincial synod of Merida in Spain (Harduin, iii. 997); to their *violence*, the council of Braga, A.D. 675, where they were forbidden to inflict blows. In the same year, a council at Toledo commanded the clergy to read the Bible on pain of excommunication (Harduin, t. iii. 1017); and required every new bishop to make oath, that he had neither paid nor promised to pay money for his bishopric. Even the papal chair was not free from

simony. To the *pious frauds* must be reckoned the multitude of fables which were emulously fabricated. Quite a collection of them is exhibited by Semler, *Historiæ Eccles. selecta Capita*, ii. 55, &c.; 60, &c. *Schl.*—Schlegel, whose prejudices against bishops seem quite to have destroyed his logical power, might have argued equally justly from the Holy Scriptures, the prevalence of simony, violence, and ignorance in the Apostolic age. The fact, that they are forbidden and punished by councils, shows, at least, that the sense of the majority was against such things. *Ed.*]

² See Jo. Launoy, *Assertio Inquisitionis in Chartam Immunitatis S. Germani*; Opp. t. iii. pt. i. p. 50, &c. Baluze, *Miscellan.* ii. 159, iv. 108. Muratori, *Antiquit. Italic.* ii. 944, 949, &c.

³ See Jo. Launoy, *Examen Privilegii S. Germani*; Opp. t. iii. pt. i. p. 282. Dav. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britannicæ*, i. 43, 44, 49, &c.

⁴ Gervais, *Hist. de l'Abbé Suger*, i. 9—16.

pitious to them through the prayers of monks. Rules for monastic life were drawn up by *Fructuosus*, *Isidore*, *John Gerundinensis*, *Columbanus*, and others, among the Latins:¹ for the *Rule* prescribed by *St. Benedict* was not as yet become the universal and the only rule.

§ 5. Among the writers, few can be named who were respectable for their genius or erudition. The best among the Greeks were the following: *Maximus*, a monk who contended very fiercely against the Monothelites, and wrote some explanatory works on the Scriptures, was by no means destitute of native talent; but he was a man of a violent spirit, and in that respect unhappy.² *Isychius*, bishop of Jerusalem, expounded some books of Scripture, and has left us a few *Homilies*, and other minor works.³ *Dorotheus*, an abbot in Palestine, acquired fame by the *Asceltic Dissertations*, with which he would instruct monks how to live.⁴ *Antiochus*, a superstitious monk of St. Sabas in Palestine, composed a *Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*, that is Institutes of the Christian Religion, a work of no great merit.⁵ *Sophronius*, bishop of Jerusalem, acquired the veneration of after-ages by his conflicts with those reputed as heretics in

¹ Lucas Holstenius, *Codex Regular*. ii. 225 c.

² [Maximus was born of noble parentage at Constantinople, about 580. The emperor Heraclius made him his secretary, and intended he should write the civil history of his times. But the emperor, falling into the heresy of the Monothelites, which Maximus abhorred, either disagreement between them, or the propensity of Maximus to a monkish life, led him to retire from court, and take residence in a monastery at Chrysopolis near Constantinople. Here Maximus became the abbot. Before 640, the prevalence of Monothelitic principles, or the political disquietudes of the country, led him to travel. He went to Egypt, where he had warm disputes with the principal Monothelites. In 645, he went to Rome and enjoyed the intimacy of pope Martin I. In 653, the emperor Constans II., who was a Monothelite, caused him to be arrested and brought to Constantinople to be tried for seditious conduct. He was acquitted; but refusing to promise silence, in the controversy then raging with the Monothelites, he was banished to Thrace, and confined in different places till 662, when he died in the castle of Schemra, on the confines of the Alans. His collected works, published Gr. and Lat. by Fran. Combefis, Paris, 1675, 2 vols. fol., consist of about fifty small works, answers to biblical questions, polemic and dogmatic tracts, moral and monastic pieces, and Letters. Besides these he has left us Commentaries on the Canticles, on Dionysius Areopagita, and on some parts of Gregory Nyssen. (Published from Greek MSS. by F. Cöhler, Halle, 1857. *Ed.*) He is an

inelegant, obscure, metaphysical, and mystical writer, yet learned and zealous. *Tr.*]

³ See Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiast.* de M. du Pin, i. 261. [Hesychius, or Isychius, bishop of Jerusalem, flourished about 601. A Commentary on Leviticus, in seven books, is extant in a Latin translation, about which there has been much discussion, whether it was a production of this Hesychius, or of some other. See Labbé, *Diss. Historica*; in Bellarmine, *de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* p. 227, &c. ed. Venice, 1727. The works of Hesychius, which are extant in Greek, are arguments to the twelve minor prophets and Isaiah; two hundred sentences on temperance and virtue; seven Homilies; a life of St. Longinus; an introduction to the book of Psalms; and a Comment on Ps. 77—107, and 118. He also wrote an *Eccles. History*; and some other Commentaries, which are lost. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 571, &c. *Tr.*—A sermon on St. Simeon the Just, Mai, *Class. Auct.* x. 585. *Ed.*]

⁴ [Dorotheus probably lived about 601. He wrote twenty-four ethical and ascetic dissertations (*διδασκαλίας*, seu *Doctrinæ*, de *Vita recte et pie Instituenda*), and several Epistles; which are extant, Gr. and Lat. in the *Orthodoxographia*, and in FrontoDucæus, *Auctarium*, i. *Tr.*]

⁵ Antiochus flourished in 614, and was alive in 629. His *Pandectæ divinæ Scripturæ*, or Compendium of the Christian Religion and of the Holy Scriptures, comprised in 130 Homilies, are extant in FrontoDucæus, *Auctarium*, t. i. He also wrote de *Vitiosis Cogitationibus liber*; and de *Vita S. Euphrosyni*. *Tr.*]

his days, especially with the *Monothelites*.¹ He was evidently the cause of the whole Monothelite controversy. *Andreas* of Crete has left us several *Homilies*, which are neither truly pious nor eloquent; and which some, therefore, suspect to have been falsely ascribed to him.² *Gregory Pisides*, a Constantinopolitan deacon, besides a *History of Heraclius and of the Avars*, composed a few poems and other short pieces.³ *Theodore* of Raithu is author of a book against those sects, which were considered as corrupting Christianity by their doctrines concerning the person of *Jesus Christ*.⁴

¹ See the *Acta Sanctor. Martii*, t. ii. ad diem xi. p. 65. [Sophronius was a native of Damascus, and for some time a teacher of philosophy and eloquence. He afterwards became a monk in Palestine; and in this character he sat in the council of Alexandria, held by Cyrus the patriarch of that see, in 633, for the purpose of uniting the Monothelites and the Catholics. Here Sophronius zealously opposed the seventh of the nine propositions which Cyrus wished to establish. From Alexandria he went to Constantinople, to confer with Sergius, the patriarch of that see, on the subject. Soon after he was made patriarch of Jerusalem, and wrote his long Epistle, or Confutation of the Monothelites, addressed to pope Honorius and the other patriarchs. But his country was now laid waste. The Saracens having conquered all the north of Syria, laid siege to Jerusalem in 637. The city capitulated to the Kalif Omar, who entered Jerusalem, treated Sophronius with much respect, promised him and the Christians safety and the free exercise of their religion; and having given orders for erecting the mosque of Omar on the site of the temple, retired to Arabia. Sophronius died a few months after, in the same year. His works are the Epistle or Dissertation above mentioned; four Homilies; an account of the labours and travels of the apostle Paul; the life of St. Mary the Egyptian; and a tract on the Incarnation. The best account of him and his writings is said to be that of J. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* viii. 199, &c. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 519. *Tr.*—A panegyric on SS. Peter and Paul, and a troparium, are printed by Mai, *Nov. Coll.* x. pt. 1, pp. xxv. xxix. *Ed.*]

² [Andreas a native of Damascus, became a monk at Jerusalem, a deacon at Constantinople, and at last archbishop of Crete; he was contemporary with Sophronius of Jerusalem, A.D. 635, and lived some years after. Fr. Combefis, published, as his works, Paris, 1644, in fol. Gr. and Lat. seventeen Homilies; nine Triodia, Canons, or church Hymns; and several shorter Hymns, adapted to different festivals. He afterwards published three more Homilies, and some poems, in his *Auctuar. Nov.* t. i. and ii. A *Computus Paschalis*, ascribed to

Andreas, was published Gr. and Lat. by Dionys. Petavius, *de Doctrina Tempor.* tom. iii. The genuineness of some of these pieces is suspected. *Tr.*]

³ [Gregory, or rather George Pisides, was first a deacon and chartophylax of the great church of Constantinople, and then archbishop of Nicomedia; he flourished about 640; and has left us *Cosmopoieia*, an iambic poem, on the Hexaëmeron, now in 1880 lines; and another poem, in 261 iambic lines, on the vanity of life; both published by Morel, Paris, 1585, 4to. Three other of his poems (Eulogy of Heraclius; on his Persian wars; and the assault of the Avars on Constantinople), were promised to the public by Claud. Maltret, but were not published. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xix. 106, &c. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 583. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Theodorus, a presbyter in the Laura Rhaitu in Palestine, flourished in 646, and wrote a short treatise on the incarnation of Christ, in opposition to the heresies of Manes, Apollinaris, Theodorus Mopsuest., Nestorius, Eutyches, Julian Halicar., Severus, and others. It is extant, Gr. and Lat. in Fronto Duceus, *Aucturium*, t. i. and in Latin, in the *Biblioth. Max. Patr.* t. viii. *Tr.*]

[The following Greek writers of this century are passed over by Mosheim, namely:

John Malala, a native of Antioch, who probably flourished about 601. He wrote *Historia Chronica*, from the creation to the death of Justinian I., 565, which was published, Gr. and Lat. by Humphr. Hody, Oxon. 1691, 8vo. See Cave, *Hist. Litter.* i. 568, &c.

About the same time lived Eusebius, bishop of Thessalonica, Conon, an opposer of John Philoponus, and Themistius surnamed Calonymus, all polemic writers. But only fragments of their essays and epistles have reached us in Photius and the Acts of Councils.

Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 608—639, a favourer of the Monothelite doctrine, and instigator of the famous Ecthesis of Heraclius. He has left us three Epistles, extant in the *Concilia*, t. vi.

Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, A.D. 620, and

§ 6. The most distinguished among the Latin writers were the following: *Ildefonsus* of Toledo, to whom the Spaniards gratuitously ascribe certain treatises concerning the holy virgin *Mary*.¹ Two books of Epistles, by *Desiderius* of Cahors, were edited by *Hen. Canisius*.² *Eligius* of Limoges has left us some *Homilies* and other productions.³ The two books of *Ecclesiastical Formulas* by

patriarch of Alexandria 630—640. He held a synod at Alexandria in 633, in which he proposed a *Libellus satisfactionis*, in nine chapters, designed to unite the Theodosians or Severians to the catholics. But his seventh chapter, or position, containing the doctrine of the Monothelites, was opposed, and led to fierce contests. He also wrote three Epistles to his friend Sergius of Constantinople. All these are extant in the *Concilia*, t. vi.

Theophylactus Simocatta, an Egyptian, a sophist, and a prefect, who flourished A.D. 611—629. He wrote *Historiæ Rerum a Mauritio Gestarum*, libri viii. from 582—602, edited Gr. and Lat. Ingolst. 1603, 4to, and Paris, 1648, fol. also eighty-five short Epistles (inter *Epistolas Græcicas*, Aurel. Allobrog. 1606, fol.), and *Problemata Physica*, Gr. and Lat. Antw. 1598, 8vo.

Georgius, an abbot in Galatia, A.D. 614, wrote the life of his predecessor Theodorus, in Surius and other collectors of pious lives.

George, patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 620—630. He wrote the life of John Chrysostom, which is published with Chrysostom's works.

About 630, that valuable but anonymous work, called the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, *Fasti Siculi*, and *Chronicon Paschale*, was composed; perhaps by George Pisides, or by George Patr. of Alexandria. It extends from the creation to A.D. 628. The best edition is that of du Fresne, Paris, 1689, fol.

John Moschus, Eviratus, or Euerates, a monk of Palestine, who flourished A.D. 630, after travelling extensively, wrote his monkish history, entitled *Pratum Spirituale*, *Hortulus novus*, *Limonarium*, and *Viridarium*; extant in Fr. Duçæus, *Auctar.* t. ii. and in Cotelier, *Monum. Eccl.* Gr. t. ii.

Thalassius, abbot in Libya, about 640, wrote several tracts; namely, *de Sincera Charitate*, *Vitæ continentia et mentis Regimine*, *sententiarum Hecatontadas IV.* extant in Lat. in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xii. and Gr. and Lat. in Fr. Duçæus, *Auctar.* t. ii.

Theodorus, bishop of Pharan in Arabia, near Egypt, a Eutychian and Monothelite controversial writer, from whose tracts large extracts occur in the Acts of the Lateran and sixth councils; *Concil.* t. vi.

John, archbishop of Dara in Syria, who has been placed in the fourth, fifth, sixth,

and seventh centuries, and perhaps lived about 650, wrote Commentaries, in Syriac, on the works of Dionysius Areopagita, and on the Apocalypse; extracts from which have been published by Abr. Echellens., Jno. Morin, and F. Nairon.

Basil, bishop of Thessalonica, say some, of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, say others; and who flourished perhaps A.D. 675; wrote *Scholia* on fifteen Orations of Gregory Nazianzen.

Macarius, a Monothelite, patriarch of Antioch, about A.D. 680, whose Confession of faith, and extracts from other works, are extant, *Concilia*, t. vi.

John, archbishop of Thessalonica, A.D. 680, has left us one oration, part of another, a fragment of a Hymn, and parts of a dialogue between a pagan and a Christian. *Tr.*

¹ See the *Acta Sanctor.* Januarii, ii. 535.

[Ildefonsus was nobly born at Toledo, educated at Seville, and after being a monk and abbot of the Agalian monastery near Toledo, became archbishop of Toledo, 657—667. His ten spurious homilies and discourses, and one spurious tract concerning the virgin Mary, with one genuine tract on the same subject, were published by Feuardentius, Paris, 1576; and afterwards in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xii. We have from his pen a tract on the ecclesiast. writers, in continuation of Jerome, Gennadius, &c. two Epistles, and a tract *de Cognitione Baptismi*. Several other tracts and letters, and a continuation of Isidore's *Gothic History*, are lost. *Tr.*]

² [Desiderius was treasurer to Clothair II. A.D. 614, and bishop of Cahors in France, 629—652. His first Book of Epistles contains those which Desiderius wrote to his friends, the second contains those addressed to him. They are extant in Canisius, *Lectio. Antiquæ*, t. v. and in *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. viii. *Tr.*]

³ [Eligius was born near Limoges, became a goldsmith there, and was esteemed the best workman in all France. In 635, king Dagobert sent him as ambassador to Brittany. While a layman, he erected several monasteries and churches. He was bishop of Noyon, A.D. 640—659; and continued to found monasteries and churches, and besides laboured to spread Christianity among the Flemings, the Frislanders, and the Swabians. He has left us a tract *de Rectitudine Catholice Conversationis* (which has been ascribed to Augustine), and an Epistle to Desiderius

Marculphus, a Gallic monk, help us much to discover the wretched state of religion and learning in this age.¹ The Englishman *Aldhelm* composed various poems, with no great success, on subjects relating to a Christian life.² *Julianus Pomerius* confuted the Jews, and has left us some other specimens of his genius, which are neither to be highly praised nor utterly condemned.³ To these may be added *Cresconius*,⁴ whose *Abridgment of the Canons* is well known, *Fredegarius*,⁵ and a few others.⁶

of Cahors. Of the sixteen Homilies ascribed to him, and extant in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xii. the greatest part, if not the whole, are supposed to be spurious. They are compilations from the fathers, and several of them bear marks of the ninth and tenth centuries. *Tr.]*

¹ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 565. [About 660, Marculphus, then seventy years old, at the request of the bishop of Paris, compiled this book of formulas of different instruments and writings used in ecclesiastical courts, and elsewhere, in the transaction of ecclesiastical affairs, and in the management of church property. It was published, Paris, 1665, 4to. and 1667, by Baluze, in *Capitul. Regum Francor.* ii. 369. *Tr.]*

² ["This prelate certainly deserved a more honourable mention than is here made of him by Mosheim. His poetical talents were by no means the most distinguishing part of his character. He was profoundly versed in the Greek, Latin, and Saxon languages. He appeared also with dignity in the Paschal controversy, that so long divided the Saxon and British churches. See Collier's *Ecclesiastical Hist.* i. 121." *Macl.*—Aldhelm was a relation of Ina, king of the West Saxons. When young he travelled over Gaul and Italy; and pursued study with such ardour that he became one of the most learned men of the age. Returning to England, he lived first as a monk, and then for 34 years as the abbot of Malmesbury; and was bishop of Sherborne A.D. 705—709. Bede (v. 19) says, he was *undecunque doctissimus*. While abbot, he wrote, by request of an English synod, a book in confutation of the sentiments and practice of the ancient Britons and Scots in regard to Easter [addressed to Geruntius, king of Cornwall, printed among the *Epistles of St. Boniface. Ed.]* He also wrote a tract in praise of virginity, both in prose and in verse; likewise a book on the eight principal virtues; and a thousand verses of Enigmas. These and some other poems were published at Mentz, 1601, 8vo. and in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xiii. *Tr.*—His works are edited by Dr. Giles, Oxf. 1844. *Ed.]*

³ [Julianus Pomerius was bishop of Toledo, A.D. 680—690. He wrote commentaries on Joshua; a demonstration that

Christ has come, against the Jews, in three books; on death, the place of departed souls, the resurrection and final judgment, three books; on the discrepancies in the Scriptures, two books; a history of king Wamba's expedition against Paul, the rebel duke of Narbonne; and an Appendix to Ildefonsus, *de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* His works are in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xii. *Tr.]*

⁴ [Cresconius was an African bishop, and flourished A.D. 690. His *Breviarium Canonum* is a methodical Index to the canons of councils and decrees of the Roman pontiffs, digested under 300 heads. He afterwards wrote *Concordia seu Liber Canonum*, which is the same thing, except that the canons and decrees are here recited at length: both works are in Voellus and Justell's *Biblioth. Juris Canon.* *Tr.]*

⁵ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 506. [Fredegarius Scholasticus was a Gallic monk, who flourished A.D. 640. He compiled a Chronicle, from the creation to A.D. 641, in five books. The first three books, which reach to 561, are a compilation from Julius Africanus, Eusebius, as translated by Jerome, and others: the fourth book, comprising 561—564, is an abridgment of Gregory Turonensis' *History of the Franks*: the fifth book, from 584 to 641, was composed by Fredegarius: the *Chronicon* was afterwards continued by other hands to 768. The fifth book is published among the *Scriptores Rerum Francicar.* The other books are partly in Canisius, *Lectiones Antiq.* t. ii. and partly in Gregory Turon. *Histor. Francor.* *Tr.]*

⁶ [The following catalogue embraces the Latin writers omitted by Mosheim.

Paterius, pupil of Gregory the Great, and bishop of Brescia, about 601. He wrote a Collection of Scripture testimonies, in three books; two from the Old Test. and one from the New; published with the works of Gregory the Great.

Faustus, a monk brought up by St. Benedict, and sent into Gaul with St. Maurus. He wrote, A.D. 606, the life of St. Maurus, and the life of St. Severinus. Both are extant in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* t. i.

Marcus, a disciple and companion of St. Benedict, and versifier of the life of Benedict by Gregory the Great; fl. A.D. 606.

Boniface IV., pope A.D. 615, has left us an Epistle to king Ethelbert of Kent; and a Synodic Decree: in the *Concil.* t. v. [Jaffé, 154. *Ed.*]

Bulgaranus, a Spanish Goth, and count, A.D. 601. Six of his Epistles, still preserved, have been often consulted, but never published.

Sisebut, a Gothic king in Spain, A.D. 612—621. Several of his Epistles are preserved; and likewise his life and martyrdom of St. Desiderius.

Boniface V., pope A.D. 620—626. His Epistle to Justus, bishop of Rochester; another to Edwin, king of Northumberland; and a third to Edilburga, Edwin's queen, are extant in Baronius, *Annales*, ad ann. 618 and 625, also in the *Concil.* t. v. [Jaffé, 156. *Ed.*]

Nennius, a British monk, and abbot of Bangor, about 620 [rather 809 or later. *Ed.*] and often confounded with the Irish Gildas. He wrote *de Gestis Britonum Liber, sive Breviarium*, or a *History of the Britons*; the MS. of which is still preserved at Westminster and at Cambridge. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 620. [Edited by Gale, 1691; by Gunn, 1819; by Stevenson, 1838; by Petrie, 1848. *Ed.*]

Honorius, pope A.D. 626—638. He was a Monothelite. Eight of his Epistles, which fully prove the fact, are extant, in the *Concil.* t. v. See Joh. Forbes, *Instruct. Hist. Theolog.* lib. v. and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xx. 401, 442, &c. 446, &c. [Jaffé, 156. *Ed.*]

Braulio, bishop of Saragossa, A.D. 627—646. He wrote the life of St. Æmilian, a monk, which is in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* t. i. also two Epistles to Isidore of Seville, and a short Eulogy of Isidore, which are published with the works of Isidore.

Jonas, an Irish monk, and abbot of Luxeuil, flourished about A.D. 630. He wrote the Lives of St. Columbanus, of Eustatius abbot of Luxeuil, of Attala abbot of Bobbio, of Bertulph abbot of Bobbio, of St. John the founder and abbot of Reomay, and of St. Fara or Burgundofara first abbot of Far-moutier. Most of these lives are in Mabillon, *Acta S.S.* t. ii.

Cummianus or Comminus, surnamed Fota or Fada, i.e. *tall*, son of Fiachna the king of West Momonia in Ireland; born 592, died 661. He was a monk, abbot, and, *some* add, bishop in Ireland; and wrote an Epistle to Segienus, abbot of Hy, on the paschal controversy (in Ussher's *Sylogæ Epistolæ Hibernicæ*, p. 24), and a book *de Penitentiarum Mensura*, which is in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xii.

John IV., pope A.D. 640—642. He wrote an Epistle to the Irish bishops, concerning the paschal controversy; another to the emperor Constantine III. in apology for

pope Honorius; and a third to Isaac bishop of Syracuse. These are extant in the *Concilia*, t. v. [Jaffé, 169. *Ed.*]

Audioenus, or Dado, archbishop of Rouen, A.D. 640—683. He lived to the age of 90, and wrote the life of St. Eligius of Noyon, in three books; published, imperfect, by Surius; and perfect, by L. D'Achery, *Spicileg.* t. v. also an Epistle.

Theodorus I., pope A.D. 642—649. He has left us two Epistles; in the *Concilia*, t. v. and *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xii. [Jaffé, 160. *Ed.*]

Eugenius, archbishop of Toledo, A.D. 646—657. He composed some tracts in verse and prose, which are extant in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xii.

Tajo or Tago, bishop of Saragossa, flourished A.D. 646. He was a great admirer of the works of Gregory the Great; went to Rome to obtain copies of them; and compiled five books of Sentences from them.

Martin I., pope A.D. 649—655. For his opposition to a decree of the emperor Constantine, called his Typus, Martin was seized by an armed force in 653, carried prisoner to Constantinople, kept in jail for a long time, tried, and banished. He ended his days at Cherson, an exile. Seventeen of his Epistles are extant; eleven of them, Gr. and Lat. are in the *Concil.* t. vi. [Jaffé, 161. *Ed.*]

Anastasius, deacon and *apocrisarius* of the Roman church. He adhered to St. Maximus, and shared in his fortunes. The year before his death, 665, he wrote a long letter, giving account of the sufferings and exile of himself, Maximus, and Anastasius, patriarch of Constantinople, and defending their tenets in opposition to the Monothelites. It is in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xii. and also prefixed to the works of St. Maximus.

Fructuosus, of Royal Gothic blood, bishop of Braga, A.D. 656—675. He was founder of many monasteries, and particularly that of Alcala; and drew up two *Rules* for monks, one in twenty-three chapters, the other in twenty. Both are published by Lu. Holstenius, *Codex Regular.* pt. ii.

Vitalianus, pope A.D. 657—672. In 668, he and Maurus, the archbishop of Ravenna, excommunicated each other. Six of his Epistles are in the *Concilia*, t. vi. [Jaffé, 165. *Ed.*]

Syricius, bishop of Barcelona, about 657. He wrote two Epistles, which are extant in Lu. D'Achery, *Spicileg.* t. i. or, new *ed.* t. iii. Cummenus, surnamed Albus; an Irish monk, and abbot of Hy, A.D. 657—669. He wrote the life of St. Columba, the first abbot of Hy, which may be seen in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* t. i.

Jonas, a disciple of St. Columbanus, and an abbot somewhere. He wrote, about A.D.

664, the life and miracles of St. John, a Burgundian abbot, in two books. The latter book is in Mabillon, *Acta*, &c. t. i. [Ed.]

Theodore, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, whom the pope made archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 668. He was a man of learning, and very efficient in action. Introducing a fine library of Greek and Latin works into England, he gave an impulse to learning among the Anglo-Saxon clergy. His only work, except an epistle, is his *Penitential*, or directory for dealing with offenders in the church.

Agatho, pope A.D. 680, 681, has left us three Epistles, which are in the *Concilia*, t. vi. [Jaffé, 166. Ed.]

Adamnanus or Adamannus, a Scotch-Irish monk, and abbot of Hy, A.D. 679—704. He was very active in bringing the Scotch and Irish to adopt the Roman practice respecting Easter. His life of St. Columba, in three books, is given by Canisius and Surius; and his topographical description of Jerusalem and other sacred places, as he learned them from Arculphus, a Gallic bishop and traveller, in three books, was published by Mabillon, *Acta S.S. secul. iii. pt. ii. or t. iv. p. 456—472* [and with very learned notes by Dr. Reeves, 1857. Ed.]

Ceolfrið, abbot of Wearmouth, about A.D.

680, and preceptor to Bede. He visited Rome; obtained of pope Sergius privileges for his monastery, and brought home books for the use of his monks. A long Epistle of his to Naiton, king of the Picts, in defence of the Roman method of keeping Easter, is extant in Bede, v. 22, and in the *Concilia*, t. vi.

Aponius, very little known, but supposed to have lived about 680, wrote a Commentary on the Canticles, in six books, which is extant in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.* t. xiv.

Valerius, a Spanish monk and abbot in Galicia, about 680. His life of St. Fructuosus is extant in Mabillon, *Acta S.S. t. ii.* Some other lives and treatises exist in MS.

Leo II., pope A.D. 682—684. Five Epistles ascribed to him are extant in the *Concilia*, t. vi. But Baronius and others think them spurious, because they represent pope Honorius to have been a Monothelite. [Jaffé, 168. Ed.]

Benedict II., pope A.D. 684—686. He has two Epistles in the *Concilia*, t. vi. [Jaffé, 169. Ed.]

Bobolenus, a monk and presbyter, who probably lived about 690. He wrote the life of St. Germanus, first abbot of Grandval, in the bishopric of Bâle, who was slain about 666; extant in Mabillon, *Acta S.S. t. ii. Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Miserable state of religion — § 2. Expositors of the Scriptures — § 3. Dogmatic theology — § 4. Practical theology — § 5. Renewal of penitential discipline — § 6. State of polemic theology.

§ 1. DURING this century, true religion lay buried under a senseless mass of superstitions; and was unable to raise her head. The earlier Christians had worshipped only God, and his Son; but those called Christians in this age, worshipped the wood of a cross, the images of holy men, and bones of dubious origin.¹ The early Christians placed heaven and hell before the view of men; these latter depicted a

¹ I will here quote a passage, well calculated to illustrate the piety of this age, taken from the life of St. Eligius, bishop of Noyon, in Lu. D'Achery's *Spicilegium Veter. Scriptor.* ii. 92: "The Lord conferred upon this most holy man, among other miraculous gifts, that, while searching and praying after them, with the most ardent faith, the bodies of the holy martyrs, which had lain con-

cealed for so many ages, were discovered." This most successful hunter of the bodies of saints, therefore, discovered the bodies of Quintin, Plato, Crispin, Crispinian, Lucian, and many others, as his biographer minutely narrates. Such ability to find the concealed bones of saints and martyrs was claimed by most of the bishops, who wished to be esteemed by the people, and to amass riches.

certain fire prepared to burn off the imperfections of the soul. The former taught that *Christ* had made expiation for the sins of men, by his death and his blood; the latter seemed to inculcate, that the gates of heaven would be closed against none, who should enrich the clergy or the church with their donations.¹ The former were studious to maintain a holy simplicity, and to follow a pure and chaste piety; the latter placed the substance of religion in external rites and bodily exercises. Did any one hesitate to believe? Two irrefragable arguments were at hand; *the authority of the church*, and *miracles*; for the working of which in these times of ignorance, but a moderate share of dexterity was requisite.

§ 2. A few, both among Greeks and Latins, applied themselves to the interpretation of Scripture. There remain some commentaries of *Isychius* of Jerusalem, on certain books of the Old Testament, and on the epistle to the Hebrews. *Maximus* composed *sixty-five Questions on the Holy Scriptures*, and some other works of like character. *Julianus Pomerius* showed his wish, and his inability to reconcile passages of Scripture between which there is apparent contradiction, and also to explain the prophecy of Nahum. To these the worst of modern interpreters are undoubtedly superior. The Greeks, especially those who would be thought adepts in mystic theology, ran after fantastic allegories; as may be seen by the *Questions* of *Maximus* above mentioned. The Latins had too little self-confidence even to venture on such a course, and therefore only culled flowers from the works of *Gregory* and *Augustine*; as is manifest, among other works, from the *Explanations of the Old and New Testament* collected by *Paterius* from the works of *Gregory the Great*.² *Thomas* of Heraclea gave to the Syrians a new translation of the New Testament.³

¹ St. Eligius, a great man of this age, says (in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, t. ii. p. 96), "He is a good Christian, who comes often to church, and brings his offering to be laid on the altar of God; who does not taste of his produce, till he has first offered some of it to God; who, as often as the holy solemnities return, keeps himself, for some days before, pure even from his own wife, so that he may come to the altar of God with a safe conscience; and who finally has committed to memory the Creed, or the Lord's Prayer.—Redeem your souls from punishment, while ye have the remedies in your power—present oblations and tithes to the churches, bring candles to the holy places, according to your wealth—and come often to the church, and beg humbly for the patronage of the saints. Which, if ye shall have observed, ye will say, coming with confidence before the tribunal of the eternal Judge, in the day of judgment, *Give, Lord, for we have given.*" [These scraps are extracted from an admirable sermon on Christian practice, in which St. Eligius almost exhausts the enu-

meration of duties. It may be seen at length in Dr. Maitland's *Dark Ages*, p. 109—113. It is impossible to suppose that Mosheim intended to misrepresent the opinions of Eligius; but Maclaine and Dr. Robertson mistook the words for a connected summary of Christian practice, and argued against its deficiency in that aspect, being ignorant that the very duties which they desiderated in it are equally strongly urged by Eligius in the same discourse. There was a good deal of bitter writing put out by Dr. Lingard, Mr. Soames, and others about it; and it is certainly a capital instance of the self-induced punishment of those who only form the acquaintance of the writings of holy men for the purpose of decrying them. *Ed.*]

² This useless performance has been usually printed with the works of *Gregory the Great*; and therefore the Benedictine monks inserted it in their recent and splendid edition of *Gregory's Works*, vol. iv. pt. ii. but with no advantage to the public.

³ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* ii. 93, 94.

§ 3. As among the Latins, philosophy was nearly extinct, and among the Greeks, only certain points of theology were brought under discussion; no one thought of reducing the doctrines of religion to a regular system, and of stating them philosophically. Yet one *Antiochus*, a monk of Palestine, composed a short summary of religious doctrines, which he calls *The Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*. His claims to rank and influence as an author, may be estimated from a lugubrious poem, subjoined to this work, in which he dolefully deplores the loss of the wood of the cross, which the Persians were said to have carried away. A more neat and judicious Latin summary of the theology of this age has not come down to us, than that in *Ildefonsus'* book *de Cognitione Baptismi*, lately brought to light by *Baluze*;—a work indeed which we do not need, but one that contains some valuable testimonies for truths which were afterwards discarded.¹ *Tajo*, or *Tago*, bishop of Saragossa, compiled *five Books of Sentences*, which are a dry and insipid body of theoretical and practical divinity, taken from *Gregory the Great*, though *Augustine* is sometimes taxed for contributions: yet that age esteemed it an admirable performance, and deserving immortality.² On certain parts of Christianity, a few individuals employed their pens; as *Maximus*, who wrote *on theology* and *on the manifestation of the Son in the flesh*, and likewise *on the two natures in Christ*; and *Theodore of Raithu*, who wrote *on the incarnation of Christ*. But those acquainted with the character of that age, will easily conjecture what sort of doctors these were.

§ 4. The lamentable state of practical theology is manifest from every writer on the subject in this age. The best of them were *Dorotheus*, in his *Ascetic Dissertations*; *Marimus* and *Alldhelm*, in some tracts; *Hesychius* and *Thalassius*, in their *Sentences*; and a few others. But in these, how many and how great are the imperfections! how numerous the marks of superstition! what constant indications of a mind vacillating and unable to grasp the subject! The laity, as they were called, had no cause to tax their teachers with excessive severity. For it was customary to confine the obligations of men to a very few virtues; as is manifest from *Alldhelm's* tract *on the eight principal vices*. And those who neglected these duties, were to incur no very formidable punishment for their offences. A life of solitude, as practised by the monks, though adorned by no marks of true piety, was esteemed sufficient of itself to atone for all kinds of guilt; and it was therefore called, by the Latins, a *second Baptism*.³ This one

¹ See *Baluze, Miscellanea*, vi. 1, &c. From this book it clearly appears, among other things, that the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, as it is called, was unknown to the Latins in the seventh century (ch. 137, p. 99), that the sacred volume was read by all Christians (ch. 80, p. 59), and other facts of the like nature. *Ildefonsus* carefully excludes philosophy and reason as authorities in religion; and teaches that there are two sources of theology, namely, the

holy Scriptures, and the writings of the ancient doctors, or as he expresses himself (p. 14, 22) "*divinæ institutionis auctoritatem, et sacræ paternitatis antiquitatem.*"

² See *Jo. Mabillon, Analecta Veteris Ævi*, ii. 68, &c.

³ [See *Harduin's Concilia*, iii. 1771, where, in the *Capitula* of *Theodore of Canterbury*, we read: *At the ordination of monks*, the abbot ought to say mass, and utter three prayers over his head; and the monk should

fact is sufficient to show, how little the precepts of *Christ* were understood in this age. Among the swarms of Greek and oriental monks, very many laboured to attain perfection, by means of contemplation; and these endeavoured to transfuse into their very natures the spirit of *Dionysius*, that father of the mystics.

§ 5. *Theodore* the Cilician, a Grecian monk, restored among the Latins the discipline of *penance*, as it is called, which had fallen into neglect, and enforced it by strict rules borrowed from the Grecian ecclesiastical jurisprudence. This man, being unexpectedly raised to the see of Canterbury in England, A.D. 668, among many other laudable deeds, reduced to a regular system, that part of ecclesiastical law which is called *penitentiary discipline*. For, by publishing his *Penitential*, a work of which kind the Latin world had never before seen, he taught priests to discriminate between the heavier and the lighter sins, the secret and the open, and likewise to measure and estimate them according to the circumstances of time, place, character, disposition, and grief of sinners, and other things. He pointed out besides the punishment due to the several kinds of faults and sins; prescribed forms of consoling, admonishing, and absolving, and, in short, determined everything required from those who hear confessions.¹ This new discipline of penance, though it was of Grecian origin, gave extreme pleasure to the Latins; and, in a short time, it spread from Britain over the whole Latin world, being strengthened by *Penitentials* drawn up after the pattern of the original one by *Theodore*. Yet it gradually declined again, in the eighth century, and by the new system of *indulgences*, as they are called, was at length wholly subverted.

§ 6. Those who wrote against the religious sects that departed from the common faith, are scarcely worthy of being named; and they would not be worth reading, were it not that they serve to elucidate the history of their times. Against the pagans, *Nicetas* composed two books;² and *Photius* mentions a person unknown to us, who he says contended against them, with a great array of arguments drawn from the fathers.³ Against the Jews contended *Julianus Pomerius*. All the heresies are described and assailed, in the little work of *Timotheus*, on the Reception of Heretics. Of the theological contests among the orthodox themselves, little can be said. In this

veil his head with a cowl seven days; and on the seventh day the abbot should remove the veil from the monk's head. As in baptism the presbyter removes the infant's veil, so should the abbot do the monk; for it is a *second Baptism*, according to the decision of the fathers, in which all sins are forgiven. *Schl.*]

¹ The *Penitential* of Theodorus is still extant, though mutilated; published by Ja. Petit, Paris, 1679, 4to. with learned Dissertations and notes. We have also the one hundred and twenty *Capitula Ecclesiastica* of the same Theodorus, in D'Achery, *Spicile-*

gium, t. ix. Harduin, *Concilia*, iii. 1771, and elsewhere. [The *Penitential* of Theodore was published completely by Mr. Thorpe, from a MS. in the library of C. C. C. C., in the second vol. of the *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*. Lond. 1840, under authority of the Record Commission. *S.*] [but it is quite certain that this was not its original form. *Ed.*]

² [Of this man, nothing more is known, than that he was a monk, and that he wrote a book against the seven chapters of Philoponus. *Schl.*]

³ Photius, *Biblioth. Codex*, clxx. p. 379.

age were scattered the seeds of those grievous contests which afterwards severed the Greeks from the Latins; nor were they merely scattered, but likewise took root in the minds of the Greeks, to whom the Roman domination appeared altogether insufferable. In Britain, the ancient Christians of that country contended with the new or Romish Christians; that is, of the Saxon race, whom *Augustine* converted to *Christ*. They contended respecting various things; as baptism, and the tonsure, but especially about the time for the celebration of the feast of Easter.¹ But these controversies did not relate to religion itself: and they were settled and determined, in the eighth century, by the Benedictine monks, and in accordance with the views of the Romans.²

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES AND CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Rites multiplied—§ 2. Some examples.

§ 1. THE Greeks, in the Council which is called *Quinisextum*, made various enactments respecting religious rites and forms of worship, in which there were several deviations from the Roman usage. These canons were publicly received in all the churches within the territories of the Greek emperors; and likewise by all churches which accorded in doctrine and worship with the Greeks, though situated in the dominions of barbarian kings.³ Nearly all the Roman pontiffs likewise added something new to the ancient ceremonies; as if they had supposed that no one could teach Christianity with success, unless he could delight a Christian assembly with unusual sights and mummeries. These rites and usages were, in the time of *Charles* the Great, propagated from Rome among the other Latin churches; for the arrogance of the pontiffs would not suffer them to deviate from the Roman usage.

§ 2. A few specimens may serve for examples. The number of festivals, which was already oppressively great, was increased by the addition of a day consecrated to the wood of the cross on which the Saviour hung;⁴ and another to the commemoration of his ascent into

¹ Cummanianus' Epistle, in Ja. Ussher's *Sylloge Epistolar. Hibernicar.* p. 23, &c. Bede, *H. E.* iii. 25. Dav. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britanni.* i. 37, 42. *Acta Sanctor.* Februarii, iii. 21, 84. [See also Dr. Warner's *Ecclesiastical Hist. of England*, book ii. and iii. *Macl.*]

² Jo. Mabillon, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctor.* *Ord. Bened.* t. iii. p. ii. &c.

³ [See below, c. v. § 12, note. *Tr.*]

⁴ [This festival was instituted by Heraclius, in 631, after he had vanquished the Persians, and recovered from them the real cross, which Chosroes had carried off fourteen years before. The festival was established by pope Honorius, and was introduced into the West in this century. For the popes were then under the dominion of the Greek emperors, and were beginning gradually to withdraw themselves from their jurisdiction.]

heaven.¹ *Boniface V.* invested the churches with those rights of asylum, which afforded to all villains a licence to commit crimes without much danger.² The art of ornamenting churches magnificently, was perfected with great diligence by *Honorius*.³ For, as neither *Christ* nor his apostles had enjoined anything on this subject, it was but reasonable that their vicar should confer this favour on mankind. Of the sacerdotal garments, and the rest of the apparatus, which was deemed necessary in the celebration of the Lord's supper, and for giving dignity and grandeur to the assemblies for public worship, I shall say nothing.

The earliest mention of this festival, which the Greeks call *σταυροφάνεια* [and the Latins, *exaltatio crucis*, kept Sept. 14. See Baronius, *Annales*, ad ann. 628. *Tr.*] occurs in the *Collatio* of St. Maximus with Theodosius, bishop of Cæsarea, A.D. 650. See Baumgarten's *Erläuterung der Christl. Alterthümer*, p. 310. *Schl.*]

¹ [Mosheim is wrong in this. Among the fifty days next following Easter, this festival had been observed by the Christians, with peculiar solemnity, ever since the fourth century, as may be inferred from Augustine, *Epist.* 118, ad Januar., Chrysostom, *Homil.* 62, t. vii. and *Homil.* 35, t. v. *Constitutiones Apostol.* l. viii. c. 33; l. v. c. 19; and especially from the *Concil. Agathense*, A.D. 506, where the 21st Canon says: Pascha, Natale Domini, Epiphania, *Ascensionem Domini*, Pentecosten et natalem S. Johannis Baptistæ, vel si qui maximi dies in festivitibus habentur, nonnisi in civitatibus aut in parochiis teneant. (Harduin, ii. 1000.) Instead of this festival, might be mentioned the *Feast of All Saints*, as originating in this century, under pope Boniface. In the Eastern churches, it had indeed been observed ever since the fourth century, on the eighth day after Whitsunday, and was called the Feast of all the Martyrs. But in the Western churches, it had the following origin: Boniface, in 610, obtained, by gift, the Pantheon at Rome, and consecrated it to the honour of the Virgin Mary and all the martyrs; as it had before been sacred to all the gods, and particularly to Cybele. On this occasion, he ordered the feast of all the Apostles to be kept on the 1st of May, which was afterwards assigned only to Philip and James; and the feast of all the martyrs, on the 12th of May. But this last feast being

frequented by a large concourse of people, Gregory IV. in 834, transferred it to a season of the year when provisions were more easily obtained, that is, to the first day of November; and also consecrated it to *All Saints*. See Baumgarten's *Christl. Alterthümer*, p. 313. *Schl.*]

² [Temples were anciently, even among pagans, places of safety for valuable goods, and for men in times of war or oppression. Among the Christians, at first, only the altar and the choir enjoyed this privilege. Afterwards, the nave of the church, and finally the whole inclosure participated in it. All persons under prosecution, whether in civil or criminal causes, might there be secure till their case was investigated. But public debtors, Jews, runaway slaves, robbers, murderers, banditti, and adulterers, were prohibited by law from this right of sanctuary. Yet in the Western churches, this right of asylum degenerated into a source of the most shocking disorders; and to them this regulation of Boniface, especially, gave the occasion. Anastasius Bibliothecarius says of him: "He ordained, that no person, who had taken refuge in a church, should be delivered up." *Schl.*]

³ [Anastasius, in his Life of this pontiff, says of him, among other things, that "he covered the [Confession or Sepulchre. *Ed.*] of St. Peter with pure silver, which weighed 187 pounds. He overlaid the great doors at the entrance of the church, which were called *Mediana*, with silver, weighing 975 pounds. He also made two large silver candlesticks, of equal dimensions, weighing each 62 pounds. He likewise made for the church of St. Andrew, a silver table before the [Confession. *Ed.*], as above, which weighed 73 pounds," &c. *Schl.*]

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF HERESIES.

§ 1, 2. Remains of the earlier sects — § 3. Nestorians and Monophysites — § 4. Monothe-lites — § 5. Their prosperous circumstances — § 6. Their adversities — § 7. Contests arising out of the *ekthesis* and the *typos* — § 8. The sixth general council — § 9. Sum of the controversy — § 10. Different opinions among that sect — § 11. Their condition after the council of Constantinople — § 12. The council called *Quinisextum*.

§ 1. THE Greeks during this century, and especially in the reigns of *Constans*, *Constantine Pogonatus*, and *Justinian II.*, were engaged in fierce combat with the *Paulicians*; whom they considered as a branch of the *Manichæans*, and who lived in Armenia and the adjacent countries. The Greeks assailed them, not only with arguments, but still more with military force, and with legal enactments and penalties. For one *Constantine*, during the reign of *Constans*, had resuscitated this sect, which was then exhausted and ready to become extinct; and had propagated its doctrines with great success.¹ But the history of this sect, which is said to have originated from two brothers, *Paul* and *John*, will be stated more explicitly under the ninth century, at which time its conflicts with the Greeks came to an open and bloody war.

§ 2. In Italy, the Lombards preferred the opinions of the *Arians* to the doctrines of the Nicene council. In Gaul and in England, the *Pelagian* and *semi-Pelagian* controversies still produced some inquietude. In the East, the ancient sects, which the imperial laws had repressed, but had by no means subdued and extinguished, assumed courage, in several places, and were able to secure adherents. Fear of the laws and of punishment, induced these sects to seek a temporary concealment; but when the power of their foes was somewhat abridged, they again resumed courage.

§ 3. The condition of the *Nestorians* and *Monophysites*, under those new lords of the East, the Saracens, was far happier than before; so that, while the Greeks were oppressed and banished, both sects took everywhere a commanding position. *Jesujabus*, chief pontiff of the Nestorians, concluded a treaty first with *Mahumed*, and afterwards with *Omar*, and obtained many advantages for his sect.² There is likewise extant an *injunction* or *Testament*, as it is commonly called; that is, a diploma of *Mahumed* himself, in which he promises full security to all Christians living under his dominions:

¹ Photius, *Contra Manichæos*, lib. i. p. 61. Peter Siculus, *Historia Manicheor.* p. 41, &c. George Cedrenus, *Compend. Hist.* p. 431, ed. Venice.

² Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vaticana*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. xciv. &c.

and though some learned men doubt the authenticity of this instrument, yet the Mahumedans do not call it in question.¹ The successors of *Mahumed* in Persia, employed the Nestorians in the most important affairs and business both of the court and of the provinces; nor would they suffer any patriarch, except the one who governed this sect, to live in the kingdom of Babylon.² The Monophysites, in Egypt and Syria, were equally fortunate. In Egypt, *Amru*, having taken Alexandria in the year 644, directed *Benjamin*, the Monophysite pontiff, to occupy the see of Alexandria; and from that time, for nearly a century, the Melchites, or those who followed the opinions of the Greek church, had no prelate.³

§ 4. Among the Greeks, who were otherwise greatly distracted, there arose a new sect, in the year 630, during the reign of *Heraclius*, which soon produced such commotions that both the East and the West united to put it down. An ill-timed effort at peace produced war. The emperor *Heraclius*, considering the immense evils resulting to the Greek empire from the revolt of the Nestorians to the Persians, was exceedingly desirous of reconciling the *Monophysites* to the Greek church, lest the empire should receive a new wound by their secession from it. He therefore, during his war with the Persians, first had a conference in the year 622, with one *Paul*, a principal man among the Armenian Monophysites; and afterwards, in the year 629, at Hierapolis, with *Anastasius*, the *Catholicus* or

¹ This famous *Testament* of Mahumed was brought into Europe from the East, in the seventeenth century, by Pacificus Scaliger, a Capuchin monk; and first published, Arabic and Latin, by Gabriel Sionita, Paris, 1630; and afterwards, the Lutherans, John Fabricius, A.D. 1638, and Hinckelmann, A.D. 1690, published it in Latin. See Jo. Henr. Hottinger, *Histor. Oriental.* lib. ii. c. 20, p. 237. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 95. Renaudot, *Histor. Patriarchar. Alexandr.* p. 168. Those who, with Grotius, reject this Testament, suppose it was fabricated by the monks living in Syria and Arabia, to circumvent their hard masters, the Mahumedans. Nor is the supposition incredible. For the monks of mount Sinai, formerly, showed a similar edict of Mahumed, which they said he drew up while a private man; an edict exceedingly favourable to them, and beyond all controversy fraudulently drawn up by themselves. The fraud was sufficiently manifest; yet the Mahumedans, a people destitute of all erudition, believed it was a genuine ordinance of their prophet, and they believe so still: this imposture is treated of by Demetr. Cantimir, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, ii. 269, &c. The argument, therefore, which Renaudot and others draw, in favour of the *Testament* in question, from the acknowledgment of its authenticity by the Mahumedans, is of little weight; because,

in things of this nature, no people could be more easily imposed upon than the rude and illiterate Mahumedans. Nor is the argument of more force, which the opposers of the *Testament* draw from the difference of its style from that of the *Koran*. For it is not necessary to suppose, that Mahumed himself composed this Testament; he might have employed his secretary: but however dubious the *Testament* itself may be, the subject matter of it is not doubtful; for learned men have proved by powerful arguments, that Mahumed originally would allow no injury to be offered to the Christians, and especially to the Nestorians.—[This Testament is a formal compact, between Mahumed on the one part, and the Nestorians and Monophysites on the other. He promises to them his protection; and they promise to him loyalty and obedience: he promises them entire religious freedom; and they promise him support against his enemies. Mahumed might have deemed it sound policy to conclude such a treaty with these sectaries; that, by their aid, he might subdue the countries of Asia subject to the Greek emperors. *Schl.*]

² Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 97, &c. Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.* p. 163, 169.

³ Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.* p. 168.

patriarch of the Monophysites, respecting the means of restoring harmony. Both of them suggested to the emperor, that the believers in one nature of *Christ*, might be induced to receive the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, and be reconciled to the Greeks; provided the Greeks would admit and profess, that in *Jesus Christ*, after the union of the two natures, there was but one will, and one voluntary operation. *Heraclius* stated what he had learned from these men, to *Sergius* the patriarch of Constantinople, who was a native of Syria, and descended from parents that were Monophysites. This prelate gave it as his opinion, that it might be held and inculcated, without prejudice to the truth, or to the authority of the council of Chalcedon, that, after the union of two natures in *Christ*, there was but one will, and one operation of will. *Heraclius*, therefore, in order to terminate the discord both in church and state, issued a decree, in the year 630, that this faith should be received and taught.¹

§ 5. At first the affair seemed to go on well. For although some refused to comply with the imperial edict, yet the two patriarchs of the East, *Cyrus* of Alexandria, and *Athanasius* of Antioch, did not hesitate to obey the will of the emperor: and the see of Jerusalem was then vacant.² The consent of the Latin patriarch, or Roman pontiff, was perhaps not deemed necessary, in an affair which related so exclusively to the Oriental church. *Cyrus*, whom the emperor had promoted from the see of Phasis to that of Alexandria, held a council, by the seventh decree of which, the doctrine of *Monothelitism*, which the emperor wished to have introduced, was solemnly confirmed.³ And this modification of the decree of Chalcedon was so influential with the Monothelites in Egypt, Armenia, and other provinces, that a great part of them returned to the church. They seem, however, to have explained the doctrine of *one will* in *Christ*, which was certainly equivocal, according to their own views, and not according to the general sentiments of their sect.

§ 6. But this fair prospect of peace and harmony was blasted, and a formidable contest was excited, by a single monk of Palestine, named *Sophronius*. He being present at the council of Alexandria, held by *Cyrus* in the year 633, strenuously resisted the article which

¹ The writers who give account of this sect, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, x. 204. The account which I have given in the text, is derived from the original sources, and rests on the most explicit testimony. [The most important of the ancient documents are found in the Acts of the council of the Lateran, A.D. 649, and in those of the sixth general council, held at Constantinople, A.D. 681, 682. Among the modern writers, the most full and candid is Waleh, *Hist. Ketz.* ix. 3—667. See also Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xx. 386—453, and Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, from Honorius on to the end of this century. Tr.]

² See Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 264.

³ [The documents of this council are in Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 1327, &c. The intention of *Cyrus* was good. He wished to gain over the Severians and the Theodosians, who composed a large part of the Christians of Alexandria; and he considered the doctrine of *one will* and *one operation* as the best means for this end. He, therefore, in several canons, spoke of *one single theandric operation* in *Christ* (ὁὖν ἐνεργούντα τὰ θεοπετῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μίᾳ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ), yet, for the sake of peace, he refrained from affirming either *one* or *two wills* and *operations*. This step, though taken with the best intentions, gave occasion afterwards to the most violent theological contests. Sch.]

related to *one will* in Christ. And the next year, 634, being made patriarch of Jerusalem, he assembled a council, in which he condemned the *Monothelites*; and maintained that, by their doctrine, the *Eutychian* error, respecting the amalgamation and confusion of natures in Christ, was revived and brought into the church. He drew over many, particularly among the monks, to his sentiments; and he made special efforts to gain over *Honorius* the Roman pontiff to his side.¹ But *Sergius* of Constantinople wrote a long and discreet letter to *Honorius*, which induced him to decide, that those held sound doctrine who taught, that there was *one will* and *one operation* in Christ.² Hence arose severe contests, which divided the commonwealth, as well as the church, into two parties.

¹ [Sophronius was most sincere and decorous in his opposition to the doctrine of Monothelitism. In the council of Alexandria, he fell down before Cyrus, and entreated him not to sanction such a doctrine. But he was alone in his opposition. Cyrus treated him tenderly, advised him to confer with Sergius the patriarch of Constantinople on the subject, and wrote a letter to Sergius for Sophronius to carry. When arrived at Constantinople, Sergius endeavoured to soothe him, represented the point as unessential, agreed to write to Cyrus not to allow any controversy on the subject, but to leave every one at full liberty to speculate as he pleased about it. Sophronius now agreed to keep silence; but when made patriarch of Jerusalem, his conscience would not let him rest. Whether he assembled a provincial synod, as Mosheim asserts, is questionable: but his circular epistle to the other patriarchs on occasion of his consecration, contained an elaborate discussion of the subject, and a host of quotations from the fathers, in proof that the doctrine of *two wills* and *two operations* was the only true doctrine. See the letter in Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 1257. Tr.]

² This the adherents to the Roman pontiffs have taken the utmost pains to disprove, lest one of the pontiffs should seem to have erred in a matter of such moment. See, among many others, Jo. Harduin, *de Sacramento Altaris*, in his *Opp. Selecta*, p. 255, &c. And, indeed, it is not difficult either to accuse or excuse the man; for he appears not to have known what he did think on the subject, and to have annexed no very definite ideas to the words which he used. Yet he *did* say, that there was but *one will*, and *one operation of will* in Christ; and for this, he was condemned in the council of Constantinople. He was therefore a *heretic*, beyond all controversy, if it be true that universal councils cannot err. See Ja. Benign. Bossuet, *Defensio Declarationis quam Clerus Gallicanus, anno 1682, de Potestate Ecclesiastica sanxit*, pt. ii. lib. xii.

cap. 21, &c. p. 182, &c. Add Ja. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, i. 391, &c. [Honorius was informed, by Sergius, in the above-mentioned letter, of the origin and whole progress of the controversy; and he was so impressed, that, in his answer to Sergius (Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 1319, &c.), he so far agreed with Sergius, that he would not have either *one* or *two operations* and divine wills affirmed; yet he did very clearly maintain but *one will* in Christ, expressed his disapprobation of Sophronius, and declared the whole controversy to be unimportant and mere logomachy. There is extant also (ibid. p. 1351) an extract from a second letter of Honorius to Sergius, in which he still further confirms his opinion. The friends of the Roman church have taken great pains to justify this mistake of Honorius. The Acts of the sixth general council, say they, are corrupted, and the name of Honorius has been wickedly foisted into them. Honorius was not condemned for *heresy*, but for his forbearance; he meant to deny only that there were two *opposite* wills in Christ. He wrote only as a private person, and not as a bishop, and also when ill informed by Sergius; and moreover retracted afterwards his opinion. But even catholic writers have confuted these subterfuges: e. g. Richer, *Hist. Concil. General.* p. 296, &c. Du Pin, *Biblioth.* vi. 67, &c. Honorius was condemned, not only in the sixth general council, but also in the seventh and eighth, and in that in Trullo, and likewise by his own successors (Agatho, Leo II., Hadrian, &c.), and is named in several Rituals, and particularly in the Breviary, and in the festival of Leo II., together with Sergius and Cyrus, as a person *damnate memorie*: this is manifest proof, that no one then even thought of an infallibility in the Roman popes, notwithstanding in modern times the name of Honorius has been erased from the Breviaries. *Schl.*—See Bower's *Lives of the Popes* (Agatho), vol. iii. Tr.]

§ 7. To quiet these great commotions, *Heraclius* published in the year 639 an *Ecthesis* drawn up by *Sergius*, that is, a formula of faith; in which, while he forbade all discussion of the question, whether there were *only one*, or a *twofold action or operation in Christ*,¹ he clearly stated, that there was but *one will* in Christ.¹ This new law was approved by not a few, in the East, and first of all by *Pyrrhus* of Constantinople, who, on the death of *Sergius*, succeeded to that see in the year 639.² But the Roman pontiff *John IV.*, in a council held this year at Rome, rejected the *Ecthesis*, and condemned the Monothelites.³ As the controversy still continued, the emperor *Constans*, in the year 648, published, with the consent of *Paul* of Constantinople, a new edict, called the *Typus*; by which the *Ecthesis* was annulled, and silence enjoined on both the contending parties, as well with regard to *one will*, as with regard to *one operation of will* in Christ.⁴ But by the impassioned monks, silence was viewed as a crime: and at their instigation, *Martin*, the bishop of Rome, in a council of 105 bishops, in the year 649, anathematized both the *Ecthesis* and the *Typus* (but without naming the emperors), and likewise all patrons of the *Monothelites*.⁵

§ 8. The audacity of *Martin*, in anathematizing the imperial edicts, provoked *Constans* to issue orders for the arrest of the pontiff, by the exarch *Calliopas*, and for his transportation, in the year 650, to the island of Naxia. *Maximus*, the ringleader of the seditious

¹ [This *Ecthesis* is in Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 791, &c. *Schl.*]

² [Before this, *Sergius* assembled the clergy at Constantinople, and not only established the new Concordat, but ordained that all clergymen who should not adopt it, should be liable to deposition, and all monks and laymen be liable to excommunication. Extracts from the Acts of this council are given in the Acts of the Lateran council [A.D. 649], in Harduin, iii. 795, &c. *Pyrrhus*, the successor of *Sergius*, likewise received this formula in an assembly of the clergy, A.D. 640, and commanded all bishops, whether present or absent, to subscribe to it. See Harduin, iii. 797. *Schl.*]

³ [*Heraclius* transmitted the *Ecthesis* to pope *Severinus* at Rome, by the exarch *Isaacius*. (Harduin, iii. 803.) Whether *Severinus* submitted to it is uncertain; but that his envoys, sent to Constantinople to obtain the confirmation of his election, could not succeed, till they had engaged he should receive it, is certain. His successor, *John IV.*, rejected it, soon after his elevation to office, in a Roman council, of which we have only very dubious accounts. On the side of this pope stood the island of Cyprus, and Numidia, Byzacene, the Provincia Proconsularis, and Mauritania; from all of which provinces synodal epistles are still extant, which show that the bishops there

passed resolutions against the *Ecthesis*. They are in Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 727, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ [This *Typus* is in Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 823, &c. *Schl.*]

⁵ [This council was held in the church of St. John of the Lateran, and thence called the *Lateran council*. The Acts of it are in Harduin's Collection, iii. 626—946. The year before, pope *Theodore* had held a council at Rome, in which he condemned *Pyrrhus*, who had lost the patriarchate of Constantinople, in consequence of taking part in the civil commotions of that city at the election of a new emperor, together with his successor *Paul*; and had mingled some of the sacramental wine with the ink, with which he signed their condemnation. See Walch's *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 419. The emperor *Constans* hoped, by means of his *Typus*, to put an end to all these commotions; and he would undoubtedly have succeeded if he had had only candid and reasonable men to deal with. But at Rome a determined spirit of self-justification prevailed; and unfortunately, pope *Martin* was a man who sought to gain a reputation for learning, by metaphysical wrangling. He condemned, in this council, the opinions of *Theodorus of Pharan*, a zealous Monophysite; but touched so lightly on *Honorius*, as not even to mention his name. *Schl.*]

monks, was banished to Bizyca; and others, not less factious, were punished in different ways.¹ The succeeding Roman pontiffs, *Eugenius* and *Vitalian*, were more discreet and moderate; especially the latter, who received *Constans*, upon his arrival at Rome, in the year 663, with the highest honours, and adopted measures to prevent the controversy from being rekindled.² It therefore slept in silence for several years. But as it was only a concealed fire that burned in secret, and as new commotions hazardous to the public peace were constantly to be feared, *Constantine Pogonatus*, the son of *Constans*, having advised with the Roman pontiff *Agatho*, summoned a *general council*, in the year 680, which is called the *sixth* of the œcumenical councils; and here he permitted the Monothelites, and the Roman pontiff *Honorius*, to be condemned in the presence of *Agatho's* legates; and he confirmed the decrees of the council, with the sanction of penal laws.³

¹ [Pope Martin, to give the proceeding a less exceptionable aspect, was accused of various crimes. He was charged with being a partisan of the rebel exarch Olympius, with sending supplies of money to the Saracens, &c. From Naxos he was brought to Constantinople, and there subjected to a judicial trial. He would certainly have lost his head as a traitor, had not the dying patriarch Paul moved the emperor to commute his punishment into banishment to Cherson; where he soon after died in great distress. See his fourteenth and following Epistles, in Labbé, *Concilia*, t. vi. and *Concilia Regia*, t. xv. also Muratori, *History of Italy*, iv. 125, &c. *Schl.*—Also Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. iii. Tr.]

² [Vitalian, as soon as he was elected, dispatched his envoys to Constantinople, and by them sent the customary confession of his faith to the patriarch. The discreet procedure of the pope, and the political circumstances of the times, caused his envoys to be well received, and to be sent back to Rome by Constantine with splendid presents. The patriarch of Constantinople also, in his letter of reply, expressed warm desires for union and harmony. When the emperor Constans, in 663, came to Rome, in his campaign against the Lombards, the pope showed him more honour than it became his papal character to show to one who had murdered his own brother; for the emperor, a few years before, had put his own brother, the deacon Theodosius, to death. The pope with all his clergy went out to meet him, two miles from Rome, and escorted him into the city. But all the honours he showed to the emperor did not prevent him from carrying off to Constantinople all the brass which ornamented the city, and even the plates which covered the roof of the Pantheon. See Anastasius, *de Vita Vita-*

liani; and Paulus Diaconus, *Historia Longobardor.* l. v. c. 6, 7. *Schl.*]

³ [This council was called by the emperor, who presided in it in person. The number of bishops was small at first, but increased to near 200. There were eighteen sessions from the 7th Nov. 680, to the 16th Sept. 681. No one of the ancient councils was conducted with more decorum and fairness. Yet not the Bible, but the decrees of former councils, and the writings of the fathers, were the authority relied upon. All the great patriarchs were present, either personally or by their representatives. At first, the two parties were nearly balanced; but in the eighth session, March 7, George, the patriarch of Constantinople, went over to the side of the orthodox; and was followed by all the clergy of his diocese. Macarius, the patriarch of Antioch, who stood firm at the head of the Monothelites, was now outvoted, condemned, and deprived of his office. The Monothelites, as soon as they were adjudged to be heretics, lost their seats; and therefore the decrees of the council were finally carried by a unanimous vote. Theodorus of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul of Constantinople, Honorius of Rome, Macarius of Antioch, and some others, were condemned as heretics; and the doctrine of *two wills*, a human and divine, and *two kinds of voluntary acts* in Christ, defined and established. The Acts of this council, Gr. and Lat., are in Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 1043—1644; and they are not falsified, as some Catholics formerly asserted. See Combefis, *Diss. Apologet. pro Actis VI. Synodi*, in his *Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr. nov.* ii. 65. Jo. Forbes, *Instructio Hist. Theol.* l. v. c. 10. Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclés.* vi. 61. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 605. Bower, *Lives of the Popes* (Agatho), v. iii. Tr.]

§ 9. It is very difficult to define the real sentiments of the Monothelites, or what it was that their adversaries condemned: for neither party is uniform in its statements, and both disclaim the errors objected to them. I. The Monothelites disclaimed all connexion with the *Eutychians* and the *Monophysites*; and confessed that there were, in Christ the Saviour, *two natures*, so united, without mixture or confusion, as to constitute but *one person*. II. They admitted that the human soul of Christ was endowed with a will, or the faculty of willing and choosing; and that it did not lose this power of willing and choosing, in consequence of its union with the divine nature. For they held and taught, that Christ was *perfect man*, as well as *perfect God*; and, of course, that his human soul had the power of willing and choosing. III. They denied this power of willing and choosing in the human soul of Christ, to be inactive, or inoperative: on the contrary, they conceded that it operated together with the divine will. IV. They, therefore, in reality, admitted *two wills* in Christ, and that both were active and operative wills.¹ Yet, V., they maintained that, in a certain sense, there was but *one will* and *one operation* of will in Christ.

§ 10. But these positions were not explained in precisely the same manner by all who were called *Monothelites*. Some of them, as may be fully proved, intended no more than that the two wills in Christ, the human and the divine, were always *harmonious*, and in this sense *one*; or that the human will always accorded with the divine will, and was, therefore, always holy, upright, and good. And in this opinion there is nothing censurable.² But others, approaching nearer to the *Monophysites*, supposed that the two wills in Christ, that is, the two powers of willing, in consequence of the *personal union* (as it is called) of the two natures, were amalgamated and became *one will*; yet they still admitted, that the two wills could be, and should be, discriminated in our conceptions. The greatest part of the sect, and those possessing the greatest acumen, supposed that the will of Christ's human soul was the *instrument* of his divine will: yet, when moved and prompted to act, it operated and put forth volitions in connexion with the divine will.³ From this supposition, the position so obstinately maintained by the *Monothelites*, was unavoidable, that in Christ there was but *one will* and *one operation of will*. For the operation of an instrument, and of him who uses it,

¹ [They admitted two *faculties* or voluntary powers, a human and a divine; but maintained, that when brought into action, they operated as if they were but *one*. By the expression *one will*, therefore, they seem to have intended *one volition*, or *act* of the will, and by *one operation* they intended *one mode of acting*. See Walch, *Hist. Ket.* ix. 584, &c. *Tr.*]

² [See Walch, *Hist. Ket.* ix. 592, &c. where he names (in Anm. 1, p. 593) Serapion, Honorius, and the Ecthesis, as giving these views. *Tr.*]

³ [According to Walch, *Hist. Ket.* ix. 594, &c. the subordination of the human will to the divine in Christ, was explained by some to be altogether *voluntary*, or a consequence of the pious resignation and the faith of the man Christ Jesus; but others supposed, that it resulted from the nature of the union by which the human nature became the instrument by which the divine nature worked; and they illustrated the subject by the subjection of man's bodily members to the empire of his mind or soul. *Tr.*]

is not twofold, but one. Setting aside, therefore, the suspicion of *Eutychianism*, and other things connected with that question, the point in controversy was, *whether the human will of Christ sometimes acted from its own impulse, or whether it was always moved by the instigation of the divine nature*. This controversy is a striking illustration of the fallacious and hazardous nature of every religious peace, which is made to rest on ambiguous phraseology. The friends of the council of Chalcedon endeavoured to ensnare the *Monophysites* by means of a proposition of dubious interpretation; and they thus imprudently involved the church and the state in long protracted controversies.

§ 11. The doctrine of the *Monothelites*, condemned and exploded by the council of Constantinople, found a place of refuge among the *Mardaites*, a people who inhabited the mountains of *Libanus* and *Antilibanus*, and who about the conclusion of this century received the name of *Maronites*, from *Jo. Maro*, their first bishop, a name which they still retain. No one of the ancients, indeed, has mentioned this man, as the person who brought the Libaniots to embrace Monothelitism; but there are strong reasons for believing that it was this *John*, whose surname of *Maro* passed over to the people of whom he was bishop.¹ This, however, is demonstrable, from the testimony of *William* of Tyre, and of other unexceptionable witnesses,² that the *Maronites* were, for a long time *Monothelites* in sentiment; and that it was not till the twelfth century, when they became reconciled with the Romish church, in the year 1182, that they abandoned the error of *one will* in Christ. The most learned of the modern *Maronites* have very studiously endeavoured to wipe off this reproach from their nation, and have advanced many arguments to prove that their ancestors were always obedient to the see of Rome, and never embraced the sentiments either of the *Monophysites*, or of the *Monothelites*. But they cannot persuade the learned to believe so; for these maintain, that their testimonies are fictitious and of no validity.³

¹ The surname of Maro was given to this monk, because he had lived in the celebrated monastery of St. Maro, on the river Orontes, before he took residence among the Mardaites on mount Lebanon. A particular account is given of him by Jo. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic.* i. 496. [Gabriel Sionita, *de Urbibus et Moribus Oriental.* cap. 8, derives the name of Maronites, from an abbot Maron, whom he extols for his holiness and his virtues; but he will acknowledge no heretical Maro. *Schl.*]

² [The passage of William of Tyre is in his *Historia Rerum in Partibus Transmarinis Gestar.* lib. xxxii. c. 8, and is this: 'A Syrian nation, in the province of Phenicia, inhabiting the cliffs of Lebanon near the city Biblos, while enjoying temporal peace, experienced a great change in its

state; for, having followed the errors of one Maro, a *heresiarch*, for nearly 500 years, and so as to be called after him Maronites, and to be separated from the church of the faithful, and maintain a separate worship, through divine influence, returning now to a sound mind, they put on resolution and joined themselves to Aimericus, the patriarch of Antioch.'—The Alexandrian patriarch Eutychius, whose annals Pocock has translated from the Arabic, likewise mentions a monk Marun, 'who asserted that Christ our Lord had *two natures*, and *one will*, one operation and person, and corrupted the faith of men; and whose followers, holding the same sentiments with him, were called Maronites, deriving their name from his name Maro.' *Schl.*—Neale, *Eastern Church*, i. 153. *Ed.*]

³ The cause of the Maronites has been

§ 12. Neither the sixth [general] council, which condemned the *Monothelites*, nor the fifth which had been held in the preceding century, enacted any canons concerning discipline and rites. Therefore, a new assembly of bishops was held by order of *Justinian II.* in the year 692, at Constantinople, in a tower of the palace, which was called *Trullus*. This council, from the place of meeting, was called *Concilium Trullanum*; and from another circumstance, *Quinisextum*, because the Greeks considered its decrees as necessary to the perfection of the Acts of the fifth and sixth councils. We have one hundred and two canons sanctioned by this assembly, on various subjects pertaining to the external part of worship, the government of the church, and the conduct of Christians. But six of these canons are opposed to the Roman opinions and customs. Wherefore the Roman pontiffs have not chosen to approve the council as a whole, or to rank it among the *general* councils, although they have deemed the greatest part of its decrees to be praiseworthy.¹

pleaded by Abrah. Echellensis, Gabriel Si-
onita, and others of the Maronite nation; but
by none of them more fully, than by Faustus
Nairon, both in his *Dissert. de Origine,
Nomine et Religione Maronitarum*, Rome,
1679, 8vo; and in his *Euoplia fidei Catho-
licæ ex Syrorum et Chaldæorum Monu-
mentis*, Rome, 1694, 8vo. Yet Nairon
induced none to believe his positions, ex-
cept Ant. Pagi (in his *Critica Baroniana*,
ad ann. 694) and P. de la Roque; in whose
Voyage de Syrie et de Montliban, ii. 28 —
128, there is a long Dissertation concerning
the origin of the Maronites. Even Asseman,
who, being a Maronite, spared no pains to
vindicate the character of his nation (*Bib-
lioth. Oriental. Vatican.* i. 496), yet does
not deny, that much of what has been writ-
ten by Nairon and others, in behalf of the
Maronites, is without weight or authority.
See Jo. Morin, *de Ordinat. Sacris*, p. 380,
&c. Rich. Simon, *Histoire Critique des
Chrêtiens Orientaux*, c. xiii. p. 146. Euseb.
Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexan-
drinor.* p. 149; and *Præfat. ad Liturgias
Orientales*. Peter le Brun, *Explication de
la Messe*, ii. 626, &c. Paris, 1726, 8vo. The
arguments on both sides are stated, and the
reader is left to form his own judgment, by
Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom.
iii. p. 10, &c. [See also Walch, *Hist. Ketz.*
ix. 474 — 488. *Tr.*]

¹ See Franc. Pagi, *Breviarium Pontiff.*
Roman. i. 486. Chr. Lupus, *Diss. de Con-
cilio Trullano*; in his Notes and Dissertations
on Councils, *Opp.* iii. 168, &c. The
Romans reject the *fifth canon*, which ap-
proves of the eighty-five Apostolic Canons,
commonly attributed to Clement: — the
thirteenth canon, which allows priests to

live in wedlock: — the *fifty-fifth canon*, which
condemns fasting on Saturdays, a custom
allowed of in the Latin church: — the *sixty-
seventh canon*, which earnestly enjoins abstin-
ence from blood and from things strangled:
— the *eighty-second canon*, which prohibits
the painting of Christ in the image of a
lamb: — and the *eighty-sixth canon*, con-
cerning the equality of the bishops of Rome
and Constantinople. The eastern patriarchs,
of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria,
Antioch, and Justiniana, with more than
200 bishops, attended this council. The
pope had no proper legate there. Yet his
ordinary representatives at the imperial
court sat in the council, and subscribed its
decisions; and Basil, the archbishop of
Crete, says in his subscription, that he re-
presented the patriarch of Rome, and all the
bishops under him. The emperor attended
the council in person, and subscribed its
decrees. In the original, a space was left
for the subscription of the pope: but when
it was sent to Rome by the emperor, and
Sergius was called on to subscribe, he showed
such a refractory spirit, as nearly cost him
his liberty. The reason was, he found the
above-mentioned canons to be contrary to
the principles and usages of his church.
For the same reason, the admirers of the
pope, to this day, are not agreed, whether
the whole council, or only the canons which
displease them, should be rejected; not-
withstanding, at an early period, pope
Adrian approved of it. On the other hand,
this council was recognised by the Greeks
as a valid one, and classed among the general
councils. See Walch, *Hist. Kirchenversaml.*
p. 441. *Schl.*]

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
UNDER THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK III.

EMBRACING EVENTS
FROM THE TIMES OF CHARLES THE GREAT
TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF
THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER.

EIGHTH CENTURY.

PART I.

HISTORY OF THE OUTWARD STATE OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THIS CENTURY.

§ 1. Propagation of Christianity in Hyrcania and Tartary—§ 2. Conversion of the Germans by Boniface—§ 3. Other expeditions and successes of Boniface—§ 4. Estimate of his apostleship—§ 5. Other apostles of Germany—§ 6. Expedition of Charlemagne against the Saxons—§ 7. Estimate of his conversions—§ 8. The reputed miracles of this century.

§ 1. WHILE the Mahumedans were harassing and subjugating the fairest provinces of Asia, and diminishing every where the lustre and reputation of Christianity, the Nestorians of Chaldea were blessing with the knowledge of heavenly truth those barbarous nations, called Scythians by the ancients, and by the moderns, Tartars, living on this side mount Imaus, and not subject to the Saracens. It is now ascertained that *Timotheus* the Nestorian pontiff, who attained that dignity A.D. 778, imbued with a knowledge of Christianity, by the ministry of *Subchal Jesu*, whom he created a bishop, first the Gelæ and Dailamites, nations of Hyrcania; and afterwards, by other missionaries, the rest of the nations of Hyrcania, Bactria, Margiana, and Sogdiana.¹

¹ Thomas Margensis, *Historiæ Monasticæ*, lib. iii. in Jos. Sim. Asseman's *Bibliotheca Orient. Vatic.* t. iii. pt. i. p. 491. See also the *Bibliotheca*, t. iii. pt. ii. cap. ix. § v. p. cccclxxviii. [Mosheim, in his *Historia Tartarorum Ecclesiastica*, p. 13, &c. relying chiefly on the preceding authorities, states that Timotheus, who was Patriarch of the Nestorians from A.D. 777 to A.D. 820, planned the mission to these

nations, inhabiting the shores of the Caspian sea; and selected for its execution one Subchal Jesu, a learned monk of the Nestorian monastery of Beth-Aben in Assyria, well skilled in the Syriac, Arabic, and Persian languages; ordained him bishop, and sent him forth. Subchal made numerous converts among the Gelæ and Dailamites, formed them into churches, and ordained elders over them. This active missionary

It is also certain, that Christianity was firmly and permanently established in those countries for several centuries, although it was sometimes disturbed by the Mahumedans; and that the bishops of these countries were always subject to the authority of the Nestorian pontiff.

§ 2. In Europe, most of the German nations were still involved in the darkness of superstition; the only exception being the tribes on the Rhine, the Bavarians, who are known to have received a knowledge of Christianity under *Theodoric*, the son of Clovis the Great, and the Eastern Franks,¹ with a few others. Attempts had been often made to enlighten the Germans, both by kings and princes, for whose interest it was, that those warlike tribes should become civilised, and also by some pious and holy men; but the attempts had met with little or no success. But in this century, *Winfrid*, an English Benedictine monk, of noble birth, who afterwards bore the name of *Boniface*, attempted this object with better success. In the year 715, he left his native country, with two companions, and first attempted in vain to disseminate Christian doctrines among the Frieslanders, who were subjects of king Radbod. Afterwards, in the year 719, having received a solemn commission from the Roman pontiff, *Gregory II.*, he more successfully performed the functions of a Christian teacher among the Thuringians, the Frieslanders, and the Hessians.²

also travelled farther East, and spread the Gospel extensively in Tartary, Chathai, and China; but on his return from his mission, to visit Timotheus and the monks of his convent, he was murdered by the barbarians. Timotheus now ordained Kardagus and Jaballaba, two other monks of Beth-Aben, and sent them with fifteen assistant monks into the same countries. These also were successful missionaries; and with the consent of Timotheus, the two bishops ordained seven of their companions to be bishops of the East; namely, Thomas, who went into India; David, metropolitan of China; and Zacchæus, Semus, Ephraim, Simeon, and Ananias. Thomas Margensis relates, that Timotheus directed the two ordaining bishops, first to ordain a third; and to supply the place of a *third bishop* at his ordination, by placing a copy of the Gospels on the seat near the right hand. Afterwards they would have the canonical number of *three* bishops to ordain the others. These new bishops dispersed themselves widely over the countries of the East, and founded many churches in India, Chathai, and China. But after the death of Timotheus, A. D. 820, we learn nothing more respecting these churches till A. D. 1000, when the famous Christian prince, called Prester John, came upon the stage. *Tr.*

¹ [Or Franconians. *Tr.*]

² All that could be said of this cele-

brated man, has been collected by Henr. Phil. Gudenius, in his *Diss. de S. Bonifacio Germanorum Apostolo*, Helmst. 1722, 4to. Yet we may add Jo. Alb. Fabricii, *Biblioth. Latina mediæ ævi*, i. 709. *Histoire Litt. de la France*, iv. 92. Jo. Mabillon, *Annales Benedictini*, and others. [The church histories of Fleury, Schroëckh, and J. E. C. Schmidt, give ample accounts of Boniface. Milner (*Church Hist.* cent. viii. c. iv.) is an admirer of Boniface. The best among the original biographers of this famous man, are Willibald, one of his disciples; and a German monk named Othlon, who lived in the eleventh century, and collected various letters of Boniface, which he has inserted in his narrative. Both these biographies, with valuable notes, are contained in Mabillonii *Acta Sanctor.* iv. 1—84, ed. Venet. 1734. According to these writers, Boniface was born at Kirton (Crediton) in Devonshire, about 680. When but four or five years old, he showed a strong inclination for a monastic life, which his father first endeavoured to eradicate, but afterwards favoured. He first entered a monastery at Exeter. From that he removed, after seven years, to the monastery of Nusselle [Nursling] in Hants, as a better place for study. Here he learned grammar, poetry, rhetoric, and biblical interpretation according to the threefold sense of Scripture. After a short time, he was a teacher of these things. At the age of 30, he was

§ 3. In the year 723, being ordained a bishop at Rome, by Gregory II., and being supported by the authority and the aid of *Charles*

ordained a presbyter. About 715, he undertook a voluntary mission to Friesland, with two monks for companions. But Radbod, the pagan king of the country, being at war with the Franks, and hostile to the Christians, gave him no encouragement; and he returned again to his monastery. The Abbey of Nuscelle was now offered him, but he refused it, because he preferred a more active employment. Soon after, having projected a mission to the pagans in Germany, he set out for Rome, to obtain the papal sanction and support to his enterprise. Daniel, the bishop of Winchester, gave him a letter of introduction to the pontiff, who readily gave him a commission to preach the Gospel to the pagans, wherever he could find them. He now visited Germany, preached in Bavaria and Thuringia; and learning that Radbod was dead, he went to Friesland, and for three years assisted Willibrord, the aged bishop of Utrecht, in spreading the Gospel, and erecting churches among the neighbouring pagans. Willibrord proposed to him to become his permanent assistant and successor; but Boniface declined, on the ground that the pope had intended he should labour in the more eastern parts of Germany. He now visited Rome a second time, in 723; was closely examined by the pope, as to his faith, and his adherence to the see of Rome; and upon his swearing perpetual allegiance to the pope, he was created a bishop, and had his name changed from Winfrid to Boniface. With numerous letters of recommendation to princes, bishops, and others, and a good stock of holy relics, Boniface returned through France, where Charles Martel received him cordially, and furnished him with a safe conduct throughout the empire. He first went among the Hessians; where he suppressed the remains of idolatry, and intrepidly cut down the consecrated *oak of Jupiter* [Thunor or Thor], which broke into four equal parts as it fell. This prodigy silenced all objections; and out of the wood of this tree a chapel was built, dedicated to St. Peter. From Hesse he went to Thuringia, where he effected a similar reform, and had contention with some who were accounted heretical. On the accession of Gregory III. to the papal chair, A. D. 731, Boniface sent an embassy to Rome, giving account of his proceedings, and proposing several questions respecting ecclesiastical law, for solution. The pope answered his inquiries, sent him a fresh supply of relics, and also the archiepiscopal pall, with instructions when and how to wear it. In

738, he visited Rome a third time, attended by a large retinue of priests and monks, and was graciously received by the pope. On his return through Bavaria, as papal legate, he divided that country into four bishoprics, and placed bishops over them; namely, John, bishop of Salzburg; Ehrenbert, bishop of Freising; Gosbald of Regensburg; and Vivilo of Passau. In 741, he erected four more bishoprics in Germany; namely, those of Würzburg, Eichstadt, Buraburg, and Erfurth, over which he placed four of his friends, Burchard, Willebald, Albinus, and Adelhar. Hitherto Boniface had been archbishop of no particular place; but in 745, he procured the deposition of Gevilib, archbishop of Mentz, charging him, in a provincial council, with having slain in single combat the man who had slain his own father in battle, and with having kept dogs and birds for sport. This council decreed the vacant see of Mentz to Boniface. As archbishop of Mentz, Boniface claimed jurisdiction over the bishop of Utrecht, which claim was contested by the archbishop of Cologne. Boniface, as archbishop, and as papal legate, presided in several councils in France and Germany, and was very active in enforcing uniformity of rites, and rigid adherence to the canons of the church of Rome. In 754, being far advanced in life, he left his bishopric at Mentz under the care of Lullus, whom he ordained his colleague and successor, and undertook a mission among the Frieslanders, who were but partially converted to Christianity. With the aid of several inferior clergymen and monks, he had brought many persons of both sexes to submit to baptism; and having appointed the 5th of June for a general meeting of the converts, to receive the rite of confirmation, at Dockum on the Bordne, between East and West Friesland, on the morning of the day appointed, and while the converts were expected to arrive, a party of pagan Frieslanders assaulted his camp. His young men began to prepare for battle; but Boniface forbade it, and exhorted all to resign themselves up to die as martyrs. He and his fifty-two companions were all murdered, and their camp was plundered. But the banditti afterwards quarrelled among themselves respecting the plunder; and being intoxicated with the wine they had gotten, they fought till several of their number were slain. The Christian converts, enraged at the murderers of their teachers, collected forces, and attacking their villages, slew and dispersed the men, plundered their houses, and enslaved their wives and children. The murdered

Martel, the mayor of the palace of the Franks, Boniface returned to his Hessians and Thuringians, and resumed his labours among them with much success. He was now assisted by several learned and pious persons of both sexes, who repaired to him out of England and France. In the year 738, having gathered more Christian churches than one man alone could govern, he was advanced to the rank of an archbishop, by Gregory III.; and by his authority, and with the aid of *Carloman* and *Pipin*, the sons of Charles Martel, he established various bishoprics in Germany; as those of *Würtzburg*, *Buraburg*,¹ *Erfurt*, and *Eichstadt*; to which he added, in the year 744, the famous monastery of *Fulda*. The final reward of his labours, decreed to him in the year 746, by the Roman pontiff *Zacharias*, was, to be constituted archbishop of Mentz, and primate of Germany and Belgium. In his old age, he travelled once more among the Frieslanders, that his ministry might terminate with the people among whom it commenced: but, in the year 755, he was murdered, with fifty clergymen who attended him, by the people of that nation.

§ 4. On account of so many labours in propagating Christianity among the Germans, *Boniface* has gained the title of the *Apostle of Germany*; and a candid estimate of the magnitude of his achievements will show him to be not altogether unworthy of this title.² Yet, as an apostle, he was widely different from that pattern which the first and genuine apostles have left us. For, not to mention that the honour and majesty of the Roman pontiff, whose minister and legate he was, were quite as much his care, nay, even more, as the glory of *Christ* and his religion;³ he did not always oppose superstition with

Christians were removed to Utrecht, and there interred. Afterwards, the remains of Boniface were carried to Mentz, and thence to Fulda.—Boniface left behind him forty-two epistles; a set of ecclesiastical rules, thirty-six in number; fifteen discourses; and a part of a work on penance. *Tr.*]

¹ [Near Fritzlar, in Hesse-Cassel. *Tr.*]

² [If the man deserves the title of an apostle, who goes among the heathen, preaches to them the Gospel, according to his best knowledge of it, encounters many hardships, makes some inroad upon idolatry, gathers churches, erects houses of worship, founds monasteries, and spends his life in this business;—then Boniface justly merits this title. But if that man only can be called an apostle who is in all respects like to Peter and Paul;—who, in all his efforts, looks only to the honour of Christ, and the dissemination of truth and virtue; and for attaining these ends employs no means but such as the first apostles of Christ used;—then manifestly, Boniface was wholly unworthy of this name. He was rather an apostle of the pope, than of Jesus Christ; he had but one eye directed towards Christ; the other was fixed on the pope of Rome, and on his own fame which

depended on him. *Schl.* — Yet it is plain from the words and deeds of Boniface, that he rather looked on the pope as the vicar of Christ, than on Christ as the patron of Rome. *Ed.*]

³ The French Benedictine monks ingenuously acknowledge, that Boniface was a flatterer of the Roman pontiff, and showed him more deference than was fit and proper. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 106. 'Il exprime son dévouement pour le S. Siège, quelquefois en des termes qui ne sont pas assez proportionnés à la dignité du caractère Episcopal.' [Schlegel, in support of this charge, adduces, *Bonif. Ep.* 91, p. 126, *Ed. Serar.*, as declaring 'that all he had done for thirty-six years while legate of the holy see was intended for the advantage of the church at Rome, to the judgment of which, so far as he had erred in word or deed, he submitted himself with all humility.'—Boniface said no such thing; but that if during his thirty-six years' legation he had done anything of use to the Roman church, he wished still to complete and increase it; and if he had done anything unjustly or unwisely, he was willing to amend it according to the judgment of that church. Schlegel quotes two other letters (*Ep.* 132, p. 181), in which

the weapons which the ancient apostles used, but often overawed the minds of the people by violence and fear, often entrapped them, as it were, by artifices and fraud.¹ His epistles also betray here and there an ambitious and arrogant spirit, a crafty and insidious disposition, an immoderate eagerness to augment sacerdotal honours and prerogatives,² joined with great ignorance, not only of many things which an *apostle* ought to know, but in particular of the true character of the Christian religion.³

§ 5. Besides Boniface, others also attempted to rescue the unevangelized nations of Germany from the thralldom of superstition. Such was *Corbinian*, a French Benedictine monk, who, after various labours for the instruction of the Bavarians and other nations, became bishop

he professes and urges obedience to Rome; and Ep. 97, p. 132, in which he urges the exemption of Utrecht as a missionary see of the Roman church, from the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Cologne, who had not assisted in the work. But these only prove, what no one has contradicted, his great attachment to the see of Rome. These charges of Mosheim and Schlegel against Boniface must have had their origin in some personal feeling. They are without proof, and are now generally treated with contempt. *Ed.*]

¹ [Schlegel charges Boniface with having 'marched into Thuringia at the head of an army;' and at the time he was murdered by the Frieslanders, having soldiers with him as his body-guard: 'and so, in all his enterprises, he had the support of the civil arm, afforded to him by Charles Martel, Carloman, and Pipin.'—Yet there is no proof that he ever used force in conversion. The arguments which Daniel of Winchester advised him to use with the pagans; viz. proofs of the impotence of the heathen gods drawn from their inability to punish or reward, can hardly be made ground of accusation against Boniface, as there is no proof that he ever used them; nor were they proposed by themselves as a demonstration of the Gospel, but as part of a refutation of paganism by natural religion. Boniface's belief in miracles, also adduced by Schlegel, is chargeable on the age. That he used false miracles himself is not true. *Ed.*]

² [Consider only his conduct towards those bishops and presbyters, who had before received ordination, and refused to receive it again from him according to the Romish rites, and would not, in general, subject themselves to Romish supremacy and Romish forms of worship. These must be regarded as *false brethren, heretics, blasphemers, servants of the devil, and fore-runners of Anti-Christ*. They must be excommunicated, be cast into prisons, and receive corporeal punishments. See with

what violence he breaks out against Adelbert, Clemens, Sampson, Gottschalk, Ehremwolf, Virgilius, and others, in his epistles;—how bitterly he accuses them, before the popes, and in presence of councils, &c. *Schl.*]

³ [A large part of the questions, which Boniface submitted to the consideration of the popes, betray his ignorance. But still more so, does his decision of the case of conscience, when a Bavarian priest, who did not understand Latin, had baptized with these words, *Baptizo te in nomine patria et filia et spiritua sancta*; which baptism he pronounced to be null and void: and likewise his persecution of the priest Virgilius in Bavaria, who maintained that the earth is globular, and consequently inhabitable on the other side of it, and there enlightened by the sun and moon. Boniface looked upon this as a gross heresy; and he accused the man before the pope, who actually excommunicated him for a heretic. See the tenth Ep. of Zacharias, in Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 1912. *Schl.*—In this, and the preceding notes, Schlegel has laboured with the zeal of a prosecutor, to substantiate the heavy charges of Dr. Mosheim against Boniface. I have carefully read the original lives of this missionary, and also a considerable part of his correspondence; and I must say, I think Dr. Mosheim, and his annotator Schlegel, have not done impartial justice to this eminent man. He appears to me, to have been one of the most sincere and honest men of his age; though he partook largely in the common faults of his time, an excessive attachment to monkery, and a superstitious regard for the canons of the church and the externals of religion. With all his imperfections, he deserves to be classed with those who followed Christ, according to the best light they had, and who did much to advance true religion among men. *Tr.*]

of Freysing.¹ Such also was *Pirmin*, a French monk, nearly contemporary with Boniface, who taught Christianity amidst various sufferings in Helvetia, Alsace, and Bavaria, and presided over several monasteries.² Such, likewise, was *Lebwin*, an Englishman, who laboured with earnestness and zeal, though with little success, to persuade the warlike Saxon nation, the Frieslanders, the Belgians, and other nations, to embrace Christianity.³ Others of less notoriety are omitted.⁴ Neither shall I mention *Willibrord* and others, who commenced their missionary labours in the preceding century, and continued them with great zeal in this.

¹ *Cæsar. Baronii Annales Ecclesiast.* t. viii. ad. ann. 716, § 10, &c. C. Meichelbeck, *Hist. Frisingensis*, t. i. [The life of saint Corbinian, in forty-six chapters, was written by one of his pupils and successors, Aribo; and may be seen in Mabillon's *Acta Sanctor.* iii. 470—485, and in Meichelbeck, *Hist. Frising.* t. i. pt. ii. p. 3—21. Corbinian was born at Chatres, near Paris, about 680. He early devoted himself to a monastic life, and acquired great fame by his miracles. To escape from society, and enjoy solitude, he travelled into Italy, about 717, and begged the pope to assign him some obscure retreat. But the pope ordained him a bishop, and sent him back to France. His miracles and his marvelous sanctity now drew such crowds around him, that after seven years, he determined to go to Rome, and beg the pope to divest him of the episcopal dignity. On his way through Bavaria and the Tyrol, he caught a huge bear, which had killed one of his pack-horses, whipped him soundly, and compelled him to serve in place of the pack-horse. At Trent, and at Pavia, he had horses stolen, for which the thieves paid the forfeiture of their lives by the hand of God. The pope would not release him from the episcopate. He returned, by the way he came, as far as Freising, in Bavaria; where Grimoald, the reigning prince, detained him, for the benefit of himself and subjects. After six years' labours at Freising, he died, somewhat like Moses, or at least in a very extraordinary manner. He foresaw his death, and having made arrangements for it, he arose in the morning, in perfect health, bathed, dressed himself in his pontificals, performed public service, returned, and placed himself upon his bed, drank a cup of wine, and immediately expired. His biographer makes [little] mention of his efforts to enlighten his flock, or to spread the knowledge of the Gospel. He was a most bigoted monk, and exceedingly irascible. Prince Grimoald once invited him to dine. Corbinian said grace before dinner, and made the sign of the cross over the food.

While they were eating, Grimoald threw some of the food to his dog. Corbinian, in a rage, kicked over the table, and left the room, declaring to the prince, that *he* deserved no blessings, who had given food that was blessed to his dog. *Tr.*]

² *Herm. Bruschii Chronologia Monaster. German.* p. 30. Anton. Pagi, *Critica in Annales Baronii*, t. ii. ad ann. 759, § 9, &c. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 124. [The life of St. Pirminius, by Warmann, bishop of Constance at the beginning of the eleventh century, may be seen in Mabillon's *Acta Sanctor.* iv. 124—139. According to this biography, Pirminius was first chorepiscopus of either Meaux or Metz in France, where he was a devout and zealous pastor. Sintlaz, a Suabian prince, procured his removal to the neighbourhood of Constance, where there was great need of an active and exemplary preacher. He established the monastery of Reichenau, in an island near Constance; and afterwards nine or ten other monasteries in Suabia, Alsace, and Switzerland; and was very active in promoting monastic piety in those countries. He is supposed to have died about 758. *Tr.*]

³ *Huchaldi Vita S. Lebvini*; in L. Surii, *Vitis Sanctor.* die 12, Novem. p. 277. Jo. Mölleri *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 464. [Lebwin was an English Benedictine and presbyter of Ripon; about 690, with twelve companions, he went over to West Friesland, on the borders of the pagan Saxons; and for several years travelled and preached in that region, and in Heligoland. At length, he settled down at Deventer, in Overysse, where he preached with considerable success till his death, about 740. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Among these were the following. Othmar, a German monk, founder of the monastery of St. Gall. At the close of a long and exemplary life, he was maliciously accused of unchastity, by some noblemen who had robbed his monastery, and was thrown into prison, where he languished four years, and then died. Numerous miracles were wrought at his tomb. His life, by Walafrid Strabo, is in Mabillon's *Acta Sanctor.* iv. 139, &c.—Willibald, bishop of Eichstadt,

§ 6. In the year 772, *Charles the Great*, king of the Franks, undertook to tame and to withdraw from idolatry the extensive nation of the Saxons, who occupied a large portion of Germany, and were almost perpetually at war with the Franks, respecting their boundaries and other things; for he hoped, if their minds should become imbued with the Christian doctrines, that they would gradually lay aside their ferocity, and learn to endure the empire of the Franks. The first attack upon their heathenism produced little effect: being made, not with force and arms, but by some bishops and monks, whom the victor had left for that purpose among the vanquished nation. But much better success attended the subsequent wars, which Charles undertook in the years 775, 776, and 780, against a people who were extremely brave, very fond of liberty, and particularly impatient of sacerdotal power.¹ For now, men who were attached to the superstitions of their ancestors, were so effectually assailed, as well with rewards, as with the sword and punishments, that they reluctantly ceased to resist, and suffered themselves to be baptized by the teachers whom Charles sent among them.² *Wideland* and *Albion*,

was an Anglo-Saxon monk, of honourable birth, educated in a monastery near Winchester. When arrived at manhood, he and his younger brother Wunebald left England, travelled through France and Italy, sailed to Asia Minor, and the Holy Land, where they spent seven years. Returning to Italy, they took residence in the monastery of Monte Cassino, during ten years, or till 739. The pope then sent them into Germany, to assist St. Boniface. Willibald was placed at Eichstadt, ordained priest A.D. 740, and bishop the year following. His death is placed A.D. 786. His life, written by a kinswoman, a contemporary nun of Heidenheim, is extant in Mabillon's *Acta Sanctorum* iv. 330—354.—Saint Alto, a Scotch monk, who travelled into Bavaria, and there established the monastery, called from him, Altomunster. The monastery was endowed by king Pipin, and dedicated by St. Boniface. The life of Alto is in Mabillon, l. c. p. 196, &c.—St. Sturm, a native of Noricum, and follower of St. Boniface. Under the direction of that archbishop he erected, and presided over, the monastery of Fulda, from 744, till his death, 779, except one year, which he spent in Italy, to learn more perfectly the rules of St. Benedict; and two other years, in which Pipin king of the Franks held him prisoner, under false accusations of disloyalty. In the last years of his life, he aided Charles the Great in compelling the Saxons to embrace Christianity. His life, well written by Eigil, his pupil and successor, is extant in Mabillon, l. c. p. 242—259.—St. Virgilius, whom Boniface accused of heresy, for believing the world to be globular, was an Irishman, of good education and talents. He went to France in

the reign of Pipin, who patronised him, and in 766 procured for him the bishopric of Salzburg, which he held till his death, A.D. 780. While at Salzburg, he did much to extend Christianity to the eastward of him, among the Slavonians and Huns. His life is in Mabillon, l. c. p. 279, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ I cannot dispense with quoting a passage from a very credible author, Alcuin, which shows, what it was especially that rendered the Saxons averse from Christianity, and how preposterously the missionaries sent among them conducted themselves. Alcuin. *Ep. civ.* in his *Opp.* p. 1647, says: 'Had the easy yoke of Christ, with his light burthen, been preached to the stubborn Saxons, with as much earnestness as the payment of *tithes*, and legal satisfaction for the very smallest faults, were exacted, perhaps they would not have abominated the sacrament of Baptism. *Let the Christian teachers learn from the example of the Apostles. Let them be preachers, not plunderers.*' Look at this portrait of the Apostles, that lived in this century!—Yet they are said to have wrought great miracles.

² Alcuin, as cited by William of Malmsbury, *de Gestis Rerum Anglorum*, lib. i. c. 4, published in the *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores*, Francf. 1601, fol. uses this language, 'The ancient Saxons and all the Frieslanders, being urged to it by king Charles, who plied some of them with *rewards*, and others with *threats*, were converted to the Christian faith.' See also the *Capitularia Regum Francorum* t. i. 246, 252. From the first of these passages, it appears, that the Saxons who would renounce idolatry, were *restored to their ancient freedom*, forfeited by conquest, and were *freed from all tribute to the*

indeed, who were two of the most valiant Saxon chiefs, renewed their former insurrections, and attempted to drive away once more, by violence and war, that Christianity which had been set up by violence. But the martial courage and the liberality of Charles at length brought them, in the year 785, solemnly to declare that they *were* Christians, and would continue to be so.¹ Lest the Saxons should apostatise from the religion which they had unwillingly professed, bishops were established, schools founded, and monasteries erected in every part of their country. The *Huns*, inhabiting Pannonia, were treated in the same way as the Saxons: for Charles so exhausted and humbled them, by successive wars, that he drove them into thinking of Christianity as better than slavery.²

§ 7. For serving thus the cause of Christ, a grateful posterity decreed to Charles the honours of a *saint*. In the twelfth century, accordingly, Frederic I., emperor of the Romans, desired *Paschal III.*, whom he had himself created sovereign pontiff, to enrol him among the church's tutelary deities.³ Nor undoubtedly was he undeserving of this glory, according to the views of the middle ages, as they are called, when *he* passed for a *saint* who enriched the priesthood with goods and possessions,⁴ and extended, by whatever means, the boundaries of the church. But to those who estimate sanctity, according to the views of *Christ*, Charles must appear to be any thing rather than a saint and a devout man. For, not to mention his other vices, which were certainly not inferior to his virtues, it is evident, that in compelling the Huns, Saxons, and Frieslanders to profess Christianity, he did it more for the sake of gaining subjects to himself than to Jesus Christ. And therefore he did not hesitate to cultivate friendship with the Saracens, those enemies of the Christian name, when he could hope to obtain from them some aid to weaken the empire of the Greeks, who were Christians.⁵

§ 8. The numerous miracles which the Christian missionaries to the pagans are reported to have wrought in this age, have now wholly lost the credit that they once had. The corrupt moral principles of the times allowed the use of what are improperly called *pious* frauds; hence heralds of Christianity thought it no sin to terrify or beguile,

king. The last of these passages contains this law: *If any person, of the Saxon race, shall contemptuously refuse to come to baptism, and shall resolve to continue a pagan, let him be put to death.*—By such penalties and rewards, the whole world might be constrained to profess Christianity without miracles. But what sort of Christians the Saxons so converted must have been, we need not be told. See Jo. Launoy, *de Veteri More baptizandi Judæos et Infideles*, cap. v. vi. p. 703, &c. *Opp.* t. ii. pt. ii. where he tells us, that the Roman pontiff, Adrian I., approved of this mode of converting the Saxons to Christianity.

¹ Eginhard, *de Vita Caroli Magni*; *Adam. Bremens.* l. i. c. viii. p. 3, &c., and all the

historians of the achievements of Charles, who are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. mediæ ævi*, i. 959, &c.

² *Life of St. Rudbert*; in Hen. Canisii *Lectionibus Antiquis*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 340, &c. Pauli Debreceui *Historia Ecclesiæ Reformat. in Hungar. et Transylvania*; a Lampio edita, pt. i. cap. ii. p. 10, &c.

³ Henr. Canisii *Lectiones Antiquæ*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 207. Dr. Walch [of Gottingen], *Tract. de Caroli Mag. canonizatione*.

⁴ See the last Will of Charles, in Steph. Baluzii *Capitularibus Regum Francor.* i. 487.

⁵ See Jac. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, t. ix. c. ii. p. 40, &c.

with fictitious miracles, those whom they were unable to convince by reasoning. Yet I do not suppose that *all* who acquired fame by these miracles practised imposture. For not only were the nations so rude and ignorant as to mistake almost anything for a miracle, but their instructors also were so unlearned and so unacquainted with the laws of nature, as to look upon mere natural events, if they were rather unusual and came upon them by surprise, as special interpositions of divine power. This will be readily seen by any one free from superstition, who shall take a fancy to read the *Acts of Saints* in this and the subsequent centuries.¹

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

§ 1. In the East, from the Saracens and Turks—§ 2. In the West, from the Saracens.

§ 1. THE Byzantine empire experienced so many bloody revolutions, and so many intestine calamities, as necessarily produced a great diminution of its energies. No emperor could reign securely. Three were hurled from the throne, treated with various contumelies, and sent into exile. Under *Leo III.*, the Isaurian, and his son, *Constantine* Copronymus, the pernicious controversy respecting images and the worship of them brought immense evils upon the community, and weakened incalculably the resources of the empire. Hence the Saracens were able to roam freely through Asia and Africa, to subdue the fairest portions of the country, and every where to depress, and in various places wholly to exterminate, the Christian faith. Moreover,

¹ [The miracles of this age are, many of them, ridiculous. In the life of St. Winnoek (in Mabillon's *Acta Sanctor.* iii. 195), it is stated as a miracle, that his mill, when he let go of it to say his prayers, would turn itself. And when an inquisitive monk looked through a crevice, to see the wonder, he was struck blind for his presumption. The biographer of St. Pardulphus (*ibid.* p. 541, § 18) makes a child's cradle to rock day after day, without hands; while if touched, it would stop, and remain immovable. In the life of St. Guthlac of Croyland (*ibid.* p. 263, § 19), while the saint was praying, at his vigils, a vast number of devils entered his cell, rising out of the ground, and issuing through crevices, 'of direful aspect, terrible in form, with huge heads, long necks, pale faces, sickly countenances, squalid beards,

bristly ears, wrinkled foreheads, malicious eyes, filthy mouths, horses' teeth, fire-emitting throats, lantern jaws, broad lips, terrific voices, singed hair, high cheek-bones, prominent breasts, scaly thighs, knotty knees, crooked legs, swollen ankles, inverted feet, and opened mouths, hoarsely clamorous.' These bound the saint fast, dragged him through hedges and briers, lifted him up from the earth, and carried him to the mouth of hell, where he saw all the torments of the damned. But while they were threatening to confine him there, St. Bartholomew appeared in glory to him; the devils were affrighted; and he was conducted back to his cell by his celestial deliverer.—These are only a few, among scores of others, which might be adduced. *Tr.*]

about the middle of the century, a new enemy appeared, still more savage, namely, the Turks; a tribe and progeny of the Tartars, a rough and uncivilised race, which, issuing from the narrow passes of Mount Caucasus and from inaccessible regions, burst upon Colchis, Iberia, and Albania, and then, proceeding to Armenia, first subdued the Saracens, and eventually the Greeks.¹

§ 2. In the year 714, these Saracens crossed the sea which separates Spain from Africa; and Count *Julian* acting the traitor, they routed the army of *Roderic*, the king of the Spanish Goths, and subdued the greater part of that country.² Thus was the kingdom of the West Goths in Spain, after it had stood more than three centuries, wholly obliterated, by this cruel and ferocious people. Moreover, all the sea-coast of Gaul, from the Pyrenean mountains to the Rhone, was seized by these Saracens; who afterwards frequently laid waste the neighbouring provinces, with fire and sword. *Charles Martel*, indeed, upon their invasion of Gaul in the year 732, gained a great victory over them at Poitiers;³ but the vanquished soon after recovered their strength and courage. Therefore *Charles the Great*, in the year 778, marched a large army into Spain, with a design to rescue that country from them. But though he met with considerable success, he did not fully accomplish his wishes.⁴ From this warlike people, not even Italy was safe; for they reduced the island of Sardinia to subjection, and miserably laid waste Sicily. In Spain, therefore, and in Sardinia, under these masters, the Christian religion suffered a great defeat. In Germany, and the adjacent countries, the nations that retained their former superstitions, inflicted infinite evils and calamities upon the others who had embraced Christianity.⁵ Hence, in several places, castles and fortresses were erected, to restrain the incursions of the barbarians.

¹ [See the historians of the Turkish empire; especially De Guignes, *History of the Huns and Turks*. Schl.]

² Jo. Mariana, *Rerum Hispanicar.* l. vi. c. 21, &c. Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 253. Jo. de Ferreras, *Histoire de l'Espagne*, ii. 425, &c.—[Semler, *Historiæ Eccles. Selecta Capita*, ii. 127, &c., conjectures that the popes contributed to the invasion of Spain, by the Saracens. And it appears from Baronius (*Annales Eccles.* ad ann. 701, No. xi. &c.), that the Spanish king and clergy were in some collision with his holiness. Still, I can see no evidence that the popes had any concern with the Mahumedan invasion of Spain.

Count Julian, a disaffected nobleman, was probably the sole cause of this calamity to his country. Tr.]

³ Paulus Diaconus, *de Gestis Longobard.* l. vi. c. 46 et 53. Jo. Mariana, *Rerum Hispanicar.* l. vii. c. 3. Pet. Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique*, article *Abderame*, i. 11. Ferreras, *Histoire de l'Espagne*, ii. 463, &c. [Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Emp.* ch. lii. Tr.]

⁴ Henr. von Büнау, *Hist. of the German Emperors and Empire* [in German], ii. 392, &c. Ferreras, *Hist. de l'Espagne*, ii. 506, &c.

⁵ Servatus Lupus, *Vita Wigberti*, p. 304, and others.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF ERUDITION AND LITERATURE.

§ 1. The state of learning among the Greeks — § 2. Progress of the Aristotelian philosophy — § 3. Learning among the Latins, restored by Charles the Great — § 4. Cathedral and monastic schools — § 5. They were not very successful.

§ 1. AMONG the Greeks there were here and there individuals both able and willing to retard the flight of learning, had they been supported; but in the perpetual commotions which threatened extinction to both church and state, they were unpatronised. Hence, scarcely any can be named among the Greeks who distinguished themselves, either by the graces of diction and genius, or by richness of thought and erudition, or by acuteness of investigation. Frigid discourses to the people, insipid narratives about men reputed saints, vain discussions upon things of nought, vehement declamations against the Latins, and the friends or the enemies of images, histories composed without judgment; such were the monuments which the learned among the Greeks erected for their fame.

§ 2. Aristotle's method of philosophizing made, however, great progress every where, and was taught in all the schools. For after the many public condemnations of the sentiments of *Origen*, and the rise of the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, *Plato* was nearly banished from the schools to the retreats of the monks.¹ *John Damascenus* distinguished himself beyond others in promoting Aristotelianism. He attempted to collect and to illustrate its principles in several tracts designed for the less informed; and these led many persons in Greece and Syria more readily to embrace them. The Nestorians and Jacobites were equally diligent in giving currency to the principles of Aristotle, which enabled them to dispute more confidently with the Greeks respecting the natures and the person of Christ.

§ 3. The history of the Latins abounds with so many examples of

¹ [See Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* iii. 533. *Schl.*]

extreme ignorance, that one is hardly prepared for them.¹ Yet they will occasion no surprise to those who survey the state of Europe in this century. In Rome, and in certain cities of Italy, there remained some faint shadow of learning and science;² but with this exception, what literature survived had abandoned the continent, and retired beyond sea, among the Britons and Irish.³ Those, therefore, among the Latins who distinguished themselves at all by works of genius, with the exception of some few Franks and Italians, were nearly all Britons, or Scots, that is, Hibernians; as *Alcuin*, *Bele*, *Egbert*, *Clemens*, *Dungal*, *Acca*, and others. Prompted by *Alcuin*, *Charles the Great*, who was himself a man of letters, attempted to dispel this ignorance. For he invited to his court grammarians and other learned men, first out of Italy, and afterwards from Britain and Ireland; and he strove to rouse, first, the sacred order, bishops, priests, and monks (whose patrimony, in this age, seemed to be learning), then, by his own example, men in dignified and honourable posts, and their sons, to seek information upon all subjects, whether divine or human.

§ 4. By his authority and requisition, most of the bishops connected with their respective primary churches what were called *cathedral* schools; in which children and youth devoted to the church were imbued with literature. The more discerning *abbots*, or rulers of monasteries, likewise opened schools, in which some of the fraternity taught the Latin language, and other things deemed useful and necessary for one who was to be a monk or teacher.⁴ *Charles* was formerly considered as the parent and founder of the university of Paris; but all impartial inquirers into the history of those times deny him this honour: yet it is ascertained that he laid a foundation upon which this celebrated school was afterwards erected.⁵ To drive ignorance from his court, he established in it that famous school,

¹ See the annotations of Steph. Baluze on *Regino Prumiensis*, p. 540.

² Lud. Ant. Muratori, *Antiquitt. Italiane Medii Ævi*, iii. 811.

³ Ja. Ussher, *Præfatio ad Syllogem Epistolarum Hibernicarum*.

⁴ Steph. Baluze, *Capitularia Regum Francor.* i. 201, &c. Ja. Sirmond, *Concilia Gallie*, ii. 121. Cæs. Egasse de Boulay, *Diss. de Scholis Clausuralibus et Episcopali-bus*; in his *Historia Acad. Paris.* i. 79. Jo. Launoy, *de Scholis a Carolo M. per Occident. Institutis*. Herm. Conringii, *Antiquitates Academicæ*, p. 81, 315. *Histoire Littér. de la France*, iv. 6, &c., and others [In 787, Charles addressed an injunction to the bishops and abbots, requiring them to set up schools; which were not intended for little children, but for monks, who were to be taught the interpretation of Scripture, and the learning requisite for this purpose. He likewise often permitted monks to come to his court school. His commands, and

the example he exhibited in his court school, were very efficient; and soon after, the famous school of Fulda was founded, the reputation of which spread over civilised Europe, and allured numerous foreigners to it. Next to Fulda, Hirschau, Corvey, Prüm, Weissenburg, St. Gall, and Reichenau, became famous for their good schools, which might be called the high schools of that age, and were the resort of monks, designed for teachers in the inferior and poorer monasteries. Charles also exercised the wits of the bishops, by proposing to them all sorts of learned questions, for them to answer either in writing or orally. *Schl.*]

⁵ The arguments, to prove Charles the founder of the university of Paris, are no where more fully stated, than in C. E. de Boulay's *Historia Acad. Paris.* i. 91, &c. But several learned Frenchmen, Mabillon (*Acta Sanctor.* t. v. Præf. §§ 181, 182), Launoy, Claude Joly (*de Scholis*), and many others, have confuted those arguments.

called the *Palatine*; in which his own children, and those of his nobles, were instructed by masters of great reputation.¹

§ 5. But the youth left these schools not much better or more learned than when they entered them. The ability of the teachers was small; and what they taught was so meagre and dry, that it could not be very ornamental or useful to any man. The whole circle of knowledge was included in what they called the seven liberal arts; namely, grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy;² of which, the first three were called the *Trivium*, and the last four, the *Quadrivium*. How miserably these sciences were taught, may be learned from the little work of *Alcuin* upon them,³ or from the tracts of *Augustine*, which were considered to be of the very first order. In most of the schools, the teachers did not venture to go beyond the *Trivium*; and an individual who had mastered both the *Trivium* and the *Quadrivium*, and wished to attempt something still higher, was directed to study *Cassiodorus* and *Boëthius*.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS AND GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Vices of the religious teachers — § 2. Veneration for the clergy in the West — § 3. Increase of their wealth — § 4. They possessed royal rights — § 5. Causes of extravagant donations to the clergy — § 6. and especially to the pope — § 7. His good offices to *Pipin* — § 8. The rewards of his obsequiousness to the French kings. The donation of *Pipin* — § 9. Donation of *Charles the Great* — § 10. The grounds of it — § 11. Nature of the pope's jurisdiction — § 12. His prosperity checked by the Greeks; origin of the contests between the Greeks and Latins — § 13. The monastic discipline wholly corrupted — § 14. Origin of canons — § 15, 16. Power of the popes circumscribed by the emperors — § 17. Greek and oriental writers — § 18. Latin and occidental writers.

§ 1. THAT those who in this age had the care of sacred things, both in the East and in the West, were highly corrupt in morals, is abundantly testified. The oriental bishops and doctors wasted their lives in various controversies and quarrels; and, disregarding the cause of religion and piety, they disquieted the state with senseless clamours and seditions. Nor did they hesitate to imbrue their hands in the blood of their dissenting brethren. Those in the West, who pretended to be luminaries, gave themselves up wholly to various kinds of profligacy, to gluttony, the chase, lust, sensuality, and war.⁴

¹ Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. i. 281. Ma-billon, l. c. § 179, and others.

² Herm. Conringii, *Antiquitates Academ.* Diss. iii. p. 80, &c. Ja. Thomasius, *Pro-grammata*, p. 368. *Observationes Halenses*, t. vi. Obs. xiv. p. 118, &c.

³ Alcuini *Opera*, pt. ii. p. 1245, ed. Quer-cetan. This little work is not only imperfect, but is almost entirely transcribed from *Cassiodorus*.

⁴ Steph. Baluze, *ad Reginon. Prumiensem*,

Nor could they in any way be reclaimed, although *Carloman*, *Pipin*, and especially *Charles the Great*, enacted various laws against their vices.¹

§ 2. Although these vices in persons who ought to have been examples for others, were exceedingly offensive to all, and occasioned various complaints, yet they did not prevent the parties polluted by them from receiving every where the highest honour, and being revered by the vulgar as if they were divinities. The veneration and submission paid to bishops and all the sacred order was, however, far greater in the West than in the East. The cause of this will be obvious to every one who considers the state and the customs of the nations, at this time bearing sway in Europe, anterior to their reception of Christianity. For all these nations, before they became Christians, were under the power of their priests, and dared not attempt any thing important, either civil or military, without their concurrence.² When they became Christian, they transferred these high prerogatives of their priests to the bishops of the new religion; who, on their parts, asserted and claimed those very rights as their own. Hence that incredible authority of the sacred order in Europe.

§ 3. To the honours and prerogatives enjoyed by the bishops and priests, with the concurrence of the people in the West, were added, during this period, immense wealth and riches. The churches,

p. 563. Wilkins' *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, i. 90, &c.

¹ Steph. Baluze, *Capitular. Regum Francor.* i. 189, 208, 275, 493, &c. [Harduin, *Concilia*, iii. 1919, &c., where the clergy are forbidden to bear arms in war, and to practise hunting; and severe laws are enacted against the incontinence of the clergy, monks, and nuns. These laws were enacted under Carloman, A.D. 742. Among the Capitularia of Charles the Great, cited by Harduin, are laws against clergymen's lending money for twelve per cent. interest (Harduin, v. 827, c. 5)—against their haunting taverns (p. 830, c. 14)—against their practising magic (p. 831, c. 18)—against their receiving bribes, to ordain improper persons (p. 831, c. 31)—bishops, abbots, and abbesses, are forbidden to keep packs of hounds, or hawks and falcons (p. 846, c. 15)—laws were also enacted against clerical drunkenness (p. 958, c. 14)—concubinage (ibid. c. 15)—tavern-haunting (p. 959, c. 19)—and profane swearing (ibid. c. 20). *Tr.*]

² Julius Caesar, *de Bello Gallico*, lib. vi. c. 12, 13, says: 'The Druids are in great honour among them; for they determine almost all controversies, public and private; and if any crime is perpetrated, if a murder is committed, if there is a contest about an inheritance or territories, they decide and determine the rewards or punishments. If any one, whether a private or a public character, will not submit to their de-

cision, they debar him from the sacrifices.—The Druids are not accustomed to be present in battle; nor do they pay tribute with the other citizens; but are exempt from military service, and from all other burdens. Allured by such privileges, and from inclination, many embrace their discipline, and are sent to it by their parents and friends.'—Tacitus (*de Moribus Germanor.* c. vii. p. 384, ed. Gronov.) says: 'Moreover, to judge, to imprison, and to scourge, is allowable for none but the priests; and this, not under the idea of punishment, or by order of the prince, but as if God commanded it.'—Chap. xi. p. 391. 'Silence [in the public councils] is enjoined by the priests, who there have coercive power.'—Helmold, *Chron. Slavorum*, l. i. c. 36, p. 90, says of the Rugians: 'Greater is their respect for a priest, than for the king.'—Idem, *de Slavis*, l. ii. c. 12, p. 235: 'With them, a king is in moderate estimation, compared with a priest. For the latter asks for responses.—The king and the people depend on his will.'—These customs, the people of Germany, Gaul, and of all Europe, retained after their conversion to Christianity; and it is easy therefore to answer the question, Whence originated that vast power of the priesthood in Europe, of which the Christian religion has no knowledge? [Mosheim in his attack on prelacy, seems always to have had an eye on the prince bishops of the holy Roman empire, now almost forgotten. *Ed.*]

monasteries, and bishops, had before been well supplied with goods and revenues; but in this century there arose a new and most convenient method of acquiring for them greater riches, and of amplifying them for ever. Suddenly — by whose instigation is not known — the idea became universally prevalent, that the punishments for sin, which God threatens to inflict, may be bought off by liberal gifts to God, to the saints, to the temples, and to the ministers of God and of glorified saints. This opinion being every where admitted, the rich and prosperous, whose lives were now most flagitious, conferred their wealth (which they had received by inheritance, or wrested from others by violence and war, according to the customs of the age) upon the glorified saints, their ministers, and the guardians of their temples most bountifully, for religious uses, in order to avoid the very irksome penances which were enjoined upon them by the priests,¹ and render themselves secure from the endurance of evils after this life. This was the principal source of those immense treasures, which from this century onward, through all the subsequent ages, flowed in upon the clergy, the churches, and the monasteries.²

§ 4. The gifts, moreover, by which princes especially, and persons of great authority, endeavoured to appease God and the priests, and to expiate past sins, were not merely *private* possessions, which common citizens might own, and with which churches and monasteries had before been abundantly endowed; but they were also *public* gifts, or such as properly belong only to princes and nations, and pass under the name of *regalia*.³ For emperors, kings, and princes, presented to bishops, churches, and monasteries, provinces, cities, and castles, with all the rights of sovereignty over them. Thus persons whose business it was to teach contempt for the world, both by precept and example, strangely became *Dukes, Counts, Marquesses, Judges, Legislators, sovereign Lords*, and not only gave the law to bodies of people, but even marched out to war with soldiers of their own. Hence the origin of great calamities which eventually afflicted Europe, sad wars, for instance, about *investiture*, and contests about *crown-prerogatives*.

§ 5. Of this extraordinary liberality, which was never heard of out of Europe, — not the vestige of an example can be found, anterior to this century. There can, therefore, be no doubt that it grew out of the customs of the Europeans, and the form of government most common among these warlike nations. For the sovereigns of these nations used to bind their friends and clients to their interests, by

¹ Such as long and severe fasts, tortures of the body, frequent and long-continued prayers, pilgrimages to the tombs of the saints, and the like. These were the penances, imposed by the priests, on persons who confessed to them their sins; and they would be the most irksome to such as had spent their lives, without restraint, amidst pleasures and indulgences, and who wished to continue to live in the same way. Hence the opulent most eagerly embraced this new method of shunning, by the sacrifice of a

part of their estates, penalties so irksome.

² Hence the well-known phraseology, used by those who made offerings to the churches and the priest, that they made the offering, *redemptionis animarum suarum causa, for the redemption of their souls*. The property given was likewise often called, *pretium peccatorum, the price of sin*. See Lud. Ant. Muratori, *Diss. de Redemptione Peccator. in his Antiquitates Ital. Medii Ævi*, v. 712, &c.

³ [Royal rights and privileges. *Ed.*]

presenting to them large tracts of country, towns, and castles, in full sovereignty, reserving to themselves only the rights of supremacy, and a claim to military service. In thus enriching priests and bishops, princes might moreover think themselves obeying a maxim of political discretion; it being improbable that nothing but superstition was ever the occasion of these extensive grants. It was natural to reckon upon more fidelity from such as were bound by religion, and consecrated to God, than from a civil aristocracy, composed of military men, accustomed to slaughter and rapine. They wished, besides, to keep within bounds of duty their subjects, generally turbulent, by means of bishops, whose sacred thunderbolts carried great alarm.¹

§ 6. This great prosperity of the sacred order in the regions of the West took its rise in their head, the Roman pontiff; and from him went gradually downwards to inferior bishops, priests, and fraternities of monks. For the barbarous nations of Europe, on conversion to Christianity, looked upon the Roman bishop as occupying the place of the supreme head, or pontiff, of their *Druids*, or pagan priests; and as the latter had possessed immense influence in secular matters, and were exceedingly feared, they thought the same degree of reverence and honour due to the head of their bishops.² What, however, those nations spontaneously gave, the bishop of Rome willingly received; and lest, perchance, on a change of circumstances, it might subsequently be withdrawn, he provided a defence in arguments, drawn from ancient history, and the Christian religion. Hence that incredible dignity of the Roman pontiff, which sprang up in this century, and his power even in matters of civil government. Hence, too, the unhappy parent of so much war and carnage, which

¹ I will here quote a noticeable passage from William of Malmesbury, in his fifth book *de Gestis Regum Angliæ*, p. 166, among the *Scriptores Rerum Anglicanarum post Bedam*, Francf. 1601, fol. He there gives the reason for those great donations to the bishops: 'Charles the Great, in order to curb the ferocity of those nations, bestowed nearly all the lands on the churches, wisely considering, that men of the sacred order would not be so likely, as laymen, to renounce subjection to their sovereign; and moreover, if the laity should be rebellious, the clergy would be able to hold them in check, by the terrors of excommunication, and the severities of their discipline.'—I doubt not, that here is stated the true reason, why Charles, a prince by no means superstitious, or a slave of priests, heaped upon the Roman pontiff, and upon the bishops of Germany, Italy, and other countries which he subdued, so many estates, territories, and riches. That is, he enlarged, immoderately, the power and resources of the clergy, that he might, by means of the bishops, restrain and keep in subjection his dukes, counts, and knights. For instance, from the dukes of Benevento,

Spoletto, Capua, and others in Italy, much was to be feared, after the extinction of the Lombard monarchy; and hence he conferred a large portion of Italy upon the Roman pontiff, so that by his authority, power, and menaces, he might deter those powerful and vindictive princes from sedition, or overcome them, if they dared rebel. That other kings and princes, in Europe, reasoned in the same manner as Charles did, will not be questioned, by one who considers well the political constitutions and forms of government of that age. That aggrandisement, therefore, of bishops and priests, which we should naturally ascribe wholly to superstition, was also the result of civil prudence, or state policy. On the subject of *excommunications*, mentioned by Malmesbury, above, we shall have something to say hereafter.

² Julius Caesar, *de Bello Gallico*, vi. 13. 'His autem omnibus Druidibus præest unus, qui summam inter eos (Celtas) habet auctoritatem. Hoc mortuo, si qui ex reliquis excellit dignitate, succedit. At si plures pares, suffragio Druidum adlegitur; nonnunquam etiam armis de principatu contendunt.'

strengthened and augmented that power surprisingly; namely, the belief that whoever is excluded from communion by him and his bishops, loses every right, not only of a citizen, but of a man besides: a notion which flowed into the church, by Europe's evil fate, from the superstition that anciently prevailed.¹

§ 7. A striking example of that immense authority which the pontiffs had acquired even in this age occurs in Frankish history. *Pipin*, the deputy, or *mayor of the palace of Childeric*, king of the Franks, who possessed already the whole royal power, wished to strip his master even of the kingly name and honour. The Frankish nobles, however, being assembled in council, A.D. 751, to deliberate on the subject, demanded that, first of all, the pontiff should be consulted whether it would be lawful to do what *Pipin* desired. *Pipin* therefore despatched envoys to *Zacharias*, who then presided over the Roman church, with this inquiry: *Whether a valiant and warlike nation might not, consistently with divine law, dethrone an indolent king, useless for every purpose of government, and put in his place a worthier person, who had already deserved extremely well of the state?* *Zacharias*, at that time, needed aid from *Pipin* and the Franks against the Greeks and the Lombards, who were very troublesome to him; and he answered as his questioner desired. When this oracle was known in Gaul, no one raised his hand to prevent the unhappy *Childeric* from being divested of his royal dignity, or *Pipin* from mounting the throne of his king and lord. Let friends of the pontiffs consider how they can excuse this decision of Jesus Christ's vicar; for it is most certainly at variance with our Saviour's commands.² It was, however, confirmed on a visit to Gaul,

¹ Though excommunication, from the time of Constantine the Great, had among Christians every where great influence, yet it had nowhere so great influence, or was so terrific and so distressing, as in Europe. And the difference between *European excommunication* and that of other Christians, from the eighth century onward, was immense. Those excluded from the sacred rites, or excommunicated, were indeed, every where, viewed as odious to God and to men; yet they did not forfeit their rights as men and as citizens; and much less, were kings and princes supposed to lose their authority to rule, by being pronounced, by bishops, to be unworthy of communion in sacred rites. But in Europe, from this century onward, a person excluded from the church by a bishop, and especially by the prince of bishops, was no longer regarded as a king or a lord, nor as a citizen, a husband, a father, or even as a man, but was considered as a brute. What was the cause of this? Undoubtedly, the following is the true cause. Those new and ignorant proselytes confounded Christian *excommunication* with the old gentile *excommunication* practised by the pagan priests, or they supposed the former to have the

same nature and effects with the latter; and the pontiffs and bishops did all they could to cherish and confirm this error, which was so useful to them. Read the following extract from Julius Caesar, *de Bello Gallico*, vi. c. 13, and then judge whether I have mistaken the origin of European and papal excommunication: 'Si qui aut privatus aut publicus Druidum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc poena apud eos est gravissima. Quibus ita est interdictum, ii numero impiorum ac sceleratorum habentur, iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum, sermoneque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant: neque iis petentibus jus redditur, neque honos ullus communicatur.'

² See, on this momentous transaction, Charles le Cointe, *Annales Ecclesiæ Franciæ*; and Mezeray, Daniel, and the other historians of France and Germany; but especially, Ja. Ben. Bossuet, *Defensio declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pt. i. p. 225. Pet. Rival, *Dissertations Historiques et Critiques sur divers sujets*, Diss. ii. p. 70; Diss. iii. p. 156; Lond. 1726, 8vo.—and the illustrious Henr. von Büna, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, ii. 288. Yet the transaction is not stated in

A.D. 754, by the successor to *Zacharias*, *Stephen II.*, who, moreover, after freeing *Pipin*, now established in power by a reign of three years, from the obligation of an oath, which had bound him to his king, inaugurated or crowned him, with his wife and two sons.¹

§ 8. This obsequiousness of the Roman pontiffs to the Franks, was of great advantage to the church over which they presided. For vehement commotions and insurrections having arisen in that part of Italy which was still subject to the Greeks, in consequence of the decrees of *Leo* the Isaurian and *Constantine* Copronymus against images; the Lombard kings so managed those commotions by their counsel and arms, as gradually to get possession of the Grecian provinces in Italy, which were under the exarch stationed at Ravenna. *Aistulphus*, the king of the Lombards, elated by this success, also set his mind upon Rome, with its territory, and affected the empire of all Italy. The pressure of these circumstances induced the pontiff, *Stephen II.*, to implore aid from his great patron, *Pipin*, king of the Franks. That prince, accordingly, in the year 754, marched an army over the Alps, and induced *Aistulphus* to promise, by a solemn oath, to restore the exarchate of Ravenna, Pentapolis,² and all that he had taken. In 755, however, the Lombard not only betrayed his plighted faith, but also laid siege to Rome. *Pipin*, on this, again passed with his forces into Italy, compelled him to observe his promise, and with unparalleled liberality bestowed on *St. Peter*, and his church, the Grecian provinces now wrested from him; namely, the Exarchate and the Pentapolis.³

the same manner by all the writers; and by the sycophants of the Roman bishops it is generally misrepresented; for they make *Zacharias*, by his pontifical power, to have deposed *Childeric*, and to have raised *Pipin* to the throne: this the French deny, and on good grounds. Yet were it true, it would only make the pope's crime greater than it was. [See *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, iii. 331, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ Among many writers see the illustrious Bünau, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, ii. 301, 366. [and *Bower, Lives of the Popes*, iii. 352. *Tr.*]

² [This territory lay along the Gulf of Venice, from the Po, southward as far as Fermo, and extended back to the Apennines. According to *Signonius*, the Exarchate included the cities of Ravenna, Bologna, Imola, Faenza, Forlimpopoli, Forlì, Cesena, Bobbio, Ferrara, Comacchio, Adria, Cervia, and Secchia. The Pentapolis, now the March of Ancona, comprehended Rimini, Pesaro, Conca, Fano, Sinigaglia, Ancona, Osimo, Umara, Jesi, Fossombrone, Montefeltre, Urbino, Cagli, Fuceoli, and Gubbio. The whole territory might be 150 miles long, and from 60 to 80 miles broad. *Tr.*]

³ See *Car. Signonius, de Regno Italiae*, l. iii. p. 202, &c. *Opp. t. ii.* Henry count

von Bünau, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, ii. 301, 366. Muratori, *Annali d'Italia*, iv. 310, &c., and many others. But what were the boundaries of this exarchate, thus disposed of by *Pipin*, has been much controverted, and has been investigated with much industry in the present age. The Roman pontiffs extend the exarchate, given to them, as far as possible; others contract it to the narrowest limits they can. See *Lud. Ant. Muratori, Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, c. i. ii. and *Antiq. Italica Medii Ævi*, i. 64—68, 986, 987. But he is more cautious in v. 790. This controversy cannot easily be settled, except by recurrence to the deed of gift. Just. Fontanini, *Dominio della S. Sede sopra Comacchio*, Diss. i. c. 100, p. 346, c. 67, p. 242, represents the deed of gift as still in existence, and he quotes some words from it. The fact is scarcely credible; yet if it be true, it is unquestionably not for the interest of the Romish church to have this important ancient document come to light. Nor could those who defended the interests of the pontiff against the emperor *Joseph*, in the controversy respecting the fortress of Comacchio, in our age, be persuaded to bring it forward, though challenged to do it by the emperor's advocates. Francis Blanchinus, however, in

§ 9. After *Pipin's* death, *Desiderius*, king of the Lombards, again boldly invaded the patrimony of St. Peter; that is, the territories given by the Franks to the Roman church. *Hadrian I.*, who was then pontiff, had recourse to *Charles*, afterwards called the Great, the son of *Pipin*. Accordingly he crossed the Alps with a powerful army in the year 774, overturned the empire of the Lombards in Italy, which had stood more than two centuries, transported king *Desiderius* into Gaul, and proclaimed himself king of the Lombards. In this expedition, when *Charles* arrived at Rome, he not only confirmed the donations of his father to St. Peter, but went further; for he delivered over to the pontiffs, to be possessed and governed by them, some cities and provinces of Italy, which were not included in the grant of *Pipin*. But what portions of Italy *Charles* thus annexed to the donation of his father, it is very difficult, at this day, to ascertain.¹

§ 10. By this munificence, whether politic or impolitic, I leave others to determine, *Charles* opened his way to the empire of the West, or rather to the title of emperor of the West, and to supreme dominion over the city of Rome and its territory, on which the empire of the West was thought to depend.² He had, doubtless, long

his *Prolegomena ad Anastasium de Vitis Pontificum Rom.* p. 55, has given us a specimen of this grant, which bears the marks of antiquity. The motive which led *Pipin* to this great liberality was, as appears from numerous testimonies, to make expiation for his sins, and especially the great sin he had committed against his master *Childeric*.

¹ See Car. Sigonius, *de Regno Italiae*, l. iii. p. 223, &c. Opp. t. ii. Henry count von Bünau, *Historia Imperii German.* ii. 368, &c. Peter de Marca, *de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, l. i. c. xii. p. 67, &c. Lud. Ant. Muratori, *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclésiastique*, c. ii. p. 147, &c. Herm. Conringius, *de Imperio Romano-German.* c. vi. [*Bower's Lives of the Popes*, t. iii. Life of *Hadrian I.*], and numerous others. Concerning the extent of *Charles's* new donation to the popes, there is the same warm contest between the patrons of the papacy and those of the empire, as there is respecting *Pipin's* donation. The advocates for the pontiffs maintain, that Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, the Sabine territory, the duchy of Spoleto, besides many other tracts of country, were presented by the very pious *Charles* to St. Peter. But the advocates for the claims of the emperors diminish as far as they can the munificence of *Charles*, and confine this new grant within narrow limits. On this subject the reader may consult the writers of the present age, who have published works on the claims of the emperors and the popes, to the cities of Comacchio and Florence, and the duchies of Parma and Piacenza, but especially the very learned treatise of

Berret, entitled *Diss. Chorographica de Italia Medii Ævi*, p. 33, &c. The partialities of writers, if I mistake not, have prevented them from discerning in all cases the real facts; and it is easy to fall into mistakes on subjects so long involved in obscurity. *Adrian* affirms that the object of *Charles* in this new donation, was to atone for his sins. For he thus writes to *Charles* the Great in the ninety-second epistle of the *Caroline Codex*, in Muratori, *Scriptor. Rer. Italicar.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 265. 'Venientes ad nos de Capua, quam Beato Petro, Apostolorum Principi, pro mercede animæ vestræ atque sempiterna memoria, cum cæteris civitatibus obtulistis.' I have no doubt that *Charles*, who wished to be accounted pious according to the estimates of that age, expressed this design in his transfer, or deed of gift. But a person acquainted with *Charles* and with the history of those times, will not readily believe that this was his only motive. By that donation, *Charles* aimed to prepare the way for attaining the empire of the West, which he was endeavouring to secure (for he was most ambitious of glory and dominion); but he could not honourably obtain his object in the existing state of things without the concurrence and aid of the Roman pontiff. Besides this, he aimed to secure and establish his new empire in Italy, by increasing the possessions of the holy see. On this point I have already touched in a preceding note; and I think whoever carefully considers all the circumstances of the case will coincide with me in judgment.

² In reality *Charles* was already emperor

had this object in view; and perhaps his father *Pipin* had also contemplated the same thing. But the circumstances of the times required procrastination in an affair of such moment. When, however, the power of the Greeks was broken, after the unhappy death of *Leo IV.* and his son *Constantine*, especially as the impious *Irene*, whom *Charles* extremely hated, held the rod of empire, in the year 800, he did not hesitate to execute his purpose. When, accordingly, he came to Rome, this year, the pontiff, *Leo III.*, knowing his wishes, persuaded the Roman people, who were then considered free, and entitled to the power of electing an emperor, to salute him publicly as emperor of the West, and make him so.¹

§ 11. *Charles*, being made emperor, and sovereign of Rome with its territory, reserved indeed to himself the supreme power, and the prerogatives of sovereignty; but the *beneficial* dominion, as it is called, and subordinate authority over the city and adjacent country, he seems to have conferred on the Roman church.² This plan was undoubtedly suggested to him by the Roman pontiff; who persuaded the emperor, perhaps by showing him some ancient, though forged papers and documents, that *Constantine* the Great (to whose place and authority he now succeeded), on removing the seat of empire to Constantinople, committed Rome, his former capital, with its contiguous district, that is the Roman dukedom, to be possessed and

of the West: that is, the most powerful of the kings in Europe. He therefore only lacked the title of emperor, and sovereign power over the city of Rome and the adjacent country; both of which he easily obtained by the aid of *Leo III.*

¹ See the historians of those times, and especially, the best of them all, Bünau, *Historia Imperii Romano-Germanici*, ii. 537, &c. The advocates of the Roman pontiffs tell us that *Leo III.*, by virtue of the supreme power with which he was divinely clothed, conferred the empire of the West, after it was taken from the Greeks, upon the nation of the Franks, and upon *Charles* their king; and hence they infer that the Roman pontiff, as the vicar of Christ, is the sovereign lord of the whole earth as well as of the Roman empire; and that all emperors reign by his authority. The absurdity of this reasoning is learnedly exposed by Fred. Spanheim, *de Ficta Translatione Imperii in Carolum M. per Leonem III.* in his *Opp.* ii. 557. [See also Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, t. iii. *Leo III.*] Other writers need not be named.

² That *Charles* retained the supreme power over the city of Rome and its territory, that he administered justice there by his judges, and inflicted punishments on malefactors, and that he exercised all the prerogatives of sovereignty, learned men have demonstrated by the most unexceptionable testimony. See only Muratori, *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Eccles.* c. vi. p. 77, &c. Indeed, they only

shroud the light in darkness who maintain, with Justus Fontanini (*Dominio della S. Sede sopra Comacchio*, Diss. i. c. 95, 96, &c.), and the other advocates of the Roman pontiffs, that *Charles* sustained at Rome, not the character of a sovereign, but that of patron of the Roman church, relinquishing the entire sovereignty to the pontiffs. And yet, to declare the whole truth, it is clear that the power of the Roman pontiff in the city and territory of Rome was great, and that he decreed and performed many things according to his pleasure, and as a sovereign; but the limits of his power, and the foundations of it, are little known, and much controverted. Muratori (*Droits de l'Empire*, p. 102) maintains that the pontiff performed the functions of an *exarch*, or *viceroy* of the emperor. But this opinion was very offensive to Clement XI.; nor do I regard it as correct. After considering all the circumstances, I suppose that the Roman pontiff held the Roman province and city by the same tenure as he did the exarchate and the other territories given him by *Charles*, that is, as a *fief*; yet with less circumscribed powers than ordinary feudal tenures, on account of the dignity of the city, which was once the capital or the seat of empire. This opinion receives much confirmation from the statements which will be made in the following note; and it reconciles the jarring testimonies of the ancient writers and other documents.

governed by the church, but under a reservation of the imperial prerogatives: an arrangement and ordinance that could not be set aside without signal indignation from God and St. Peter.¹

§ 12. Amidst so many accessions of power and influence, the Roman pontiffs, however, sustained from the Greek emperors no slight loss of revenue and dignity. For *Leo* the Isaurian, and his son *Constantine* Copronymus, being exceedingly offended with *Gregory II.* and *III.* on account of their zeal for sacred images, not only took from them the estates possessed by the Roman church in Sicily, Calabria, and Apulia; but also exempted the bishops of those territories, and likewise all the provinces of Illyricum, from the dominion of the Roman pontiffs, and placed them under the protection of the patriarch of Constantinople. Nor could the pontiffs, afterwards, either by threats or supplications, induce the Greek emperors to restore these valuable portions of St. Peter's patrimony.² This was the first origin, and the principal cause of that great

¹ Most writers are of opinion that Constantine's pretended grant was posterior to this period, and that it was forged perhaps in the tenth century; but I believe that it existed in this century, and that Hadrian and his successor Leo III. made use of it to persuade Charles to convey feudal power over the city of Rome, and its territory, to the Roman church. For this opinion we have the good authority of the Roman pontiff himself, Hadrian I., in his epistle to Charles; which is the forty-ninth in the *Caroline Codex*, published in Muratori's *Rerum Italicar. Scriptores*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 194; and which well deserves a perusal. Hadrian there exhorts Charles, who was not yet emperor, to order the restitution of all the grants which had formerly been made to St. Peter and the church of Rome. And he very clearly distinguishes the grant of Constantine from the donations of the other emperors and princes; and, what deserves particular notice, he distinguishes it from the donation of Pipin, which embraced the exarchate, and from the additions made to his father's grants by Charles; whence it follows legitimately, that Hadrian understood Constantine's grant to embrace the city of Rome, and the territory dependent on it. He first mentions the grant of Constantine the Great thus: 'Deprecamur vestram excellentiam—pro Dei amore et ipsius clavigeri regni cœlorum—ut secundum promissionem, quam polliciti estis eidem Dei Apostolo, *pro animæ vestræ mercede* et stabilitate regni vestri, omnia nostris temporibus adimplere jubeatis.—Et sicut temporibus Beati Silvestri Romani Pontificis, a sanctæ recordationis piissimo Constantino Magno, Imperatore, *per ejus largitatem* (see the grant of Constantine itself) sancta Dei catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est, et *potestatem* in his Hesperiae partibus lar-

*giri dignatus est: ita et in his vestris felicissimis temporibus atque nostris, sancta Dei ecclesia germinet—et amplius, atque amplius exaltata permaneat—Quia ecce novus Christianissimus Dei Constantinus Imperator (N.B. Here the pontiff denominates Charles, who was then only a king, an emperor, and compares him with Constantine) his temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sanctæ suæ ecclesiæ—largiri dignatus est. (Thus far he speaks of Constantine's donation. Next, the pontiff notices the other donations, which he clearly discriminates from this.) Sed et cuncta alia, quæ per diversos Imperatores, patricios, etiam et alios Deum timentes, pro eorum animæ mercede et venia peccatorum, in partibus Tusciæ, Spoletino seu Benevento, atque Corsica, simul et Paviensi patrimonio, Beato Petro Apostolo,—concessa sunt, et per nefandam gentem Longobardorum per annorum spatia abstracta atque ablata sunt, vestris temporibus restituantur. (The pontiff adds, in the close, that all those grants were preserved in the archives of the Lateran; and that he had sent them by his ambassadors to Charles.) Unde et plures donationes in sacro nostro scrinio Lateranensi reconditas habemus; tamen et pro satisfactione christianissimi regni vestri, per jam fatos viros, ad demonstrandum eas vobis direximus; et pro hoc petimus eximiam Præcellentiam vestram, ut in integro ipsa patrimonia Beato Petro et nobis restituere jubeatis.'—By this it appears that Constantine's grant was then in the *Lateran archives* of the popes, and was sent with the others to Charles.*

² See Mich. le Quien's *Oriens Chretienus*, i. 96, &c. The Greek writers also, as Theophanes and others, acknowledge the fact, but differ a little in respect to the cause.

contest between the bishops of Rome and of Constantinople; which, in the next century, severed the Greeks from the Latins, to the great detriment of Christianity. Yet there was an additional cause existing in this century; namely, the dispute concerning the *procession of the Holy Spirit*; of which we shall treat in its proper place. But this perhaps might have been easily adjusted, if the bishops of Rome and Constantinople had not become involved in a contest respecting the limits of their jurisdictions.

§ 13. Monastic discipline, as all the writers of that age testify, was entirely prostrate, both in the East and the West. The best of the oriental monks were those who lived an austere life, remote from all intercourse with men, in the deserts of Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia: and yet among them, not only gross ignorance, but also fanatical stupidity, and shameful superstition, often reigned. The rest of their body, that lived nearer cities, not unfrequently gave trouble to the state; which obliged *Constantine Copronymus*, and other emperors, to restrain them repeatedly, by severe edicts. Most of the western monks now followed the rule of *St. Benedict*: yet there were monasteries, in various places, in which other rules were preferred.¹ As, however, their wealth increased, they scarcely observed any rule, but gave themselves up to gluttony, voluptuousness, idleness, and other vices.² *Charles the Great* would fain have cured these disorders by legislation; but he did little good.³

§ 14. This great corruption of the whole sacred order, produced in the West a new species of priests, who were an intermediate class between *monks*, or *regulars*, as they are commonly called, and *secular priests*. These adopted, in part, the discipline and mode of life of monks: that is, they dwelt together, ate at a common table, and joined in united prayer, at certain hours; yet they did not take any *vows* upon them, like the monks, and they performed ministerial functions in certain churches. They were at first called the *Lord's brethren*;⁴ but afterwards took the name of *canons*.⁵ The common opinion attributes the institution of this order to *Chrodegang*, bishop of Metz: nor is this opinion wholly without foundation.⁶ For although

¹ See Jo. Mabillon, *Præf. ad Acta Sancta Ord. Benedicti*, sæc. i. p. xxiv. and sæc. iv. pt. i. p. 26, &c.

² Mabillon treats, ingenuously, of this corruption of the monks, and of its causes, in the above work, *Præf. ad Sæcul.* iv. pt. i. p. 64, &c.

³ See the *Capitularia* of Charles the Great, published by Baluze, i. 148, 167, 237, 355, 366, &c. 375, 503, and in various other places. These numerous laws, so often repeated, prove the extreme perverseness of the monks. [See also the 20, 21, and 22 canons of the council of Cloveshoe in England, A. D. 747. Monasteria—non sint ludicarum artium receptacula, hoc est, poetarum, citharistarum, musicorum, scurrarum.—Non sint sanctimonialium do-

micilia turpium confabulationum, comesationum, ebrietatum, luxuriantiumque cubilia.—Monasteriales sive ecclesiastici, ebrietatis malum non sectentur aut expetant—sed neque alios cogant intemperanter bibere; sed pura et sobria sint eorum convivia, non luxuriosa, neque deliciis vel scurrilitatibus mixta, &c. *Tr.*]

⁴ *Frates Domini*.

⁵ *Cænonici*. See Le Beuf, *Mémoire sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, i. 174, Paris, 1743, 4to.

⁶ For an account of Chrodegang, see the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 128. Aug. Calmet, *Hist. de Lorraine*, i. 513, &c. *Acta Sanctorum*, Martii, i. 452. * The rule which he prescribed to his canons, may be seen in Le Cointe's *Annales Francor. Eccle-*

there were, anterior to this century, in Italy, Africa, and other provinces, colleges of priests who lived in the manner of *canons*;¹ yet *Chrodegang*, about the middle of this century, subjected the priests of his church at Metz to this mode of living, requiring them to sing hymns to God, at certain hours, and perhaps to observe other rites: and by his example, first the Franks, then the Italians, the English, and the Germans, were led to introduce this mode of living, in numerous places, and to found colleges of *canons*.

§ 15. Supreme power over the whole sacred order, and over all the possessions of the churches, was, both in the East and in the West, vested in the emperors and kings. Upon the power of the Greek emperors over the church, with its goods and possessions, no one entertains a doubt.² The prerogatives of the Latin emperors and kings, though flatterers of the Roman pontiffs labour to involve them in obscurity, are so certain and clear that they cannot be obscured; as the wiser in the Roman community themselves confess. *Hadrian I.*, in a council at Rome, transferred to *Charles the Great*, and his successors, the right of appointing and creating the Roman pontiffs.³ And, although neither *Charles*, nor his son *Lewis*, would use this power, they notwithstanding reserved to themselves the approbation and confirmation of the pontiff chosen by the Roman priests and people: nor could his consecration take place, unless the emperor's ambassadors were present.⁴ The Roman pontiffs obeyed the laws of the emperors, and accounted all their decisions definitive.⁵ The emperors and kings of the Franks, by their extraordinary judges, whom they called *Missi*, that is *Legates*, inquired into the lives and conduct of all priests, both superior and inferior, took cognisance of their controversies and causes, enacted laws respecting the mode of worshipping God, punished priestly delinquencies of every kind just as those of other citizens.⁶ The goods of churches and monasteries, unless

siastici, t. v. ad ann. 757, § 35, &c. and in Labbe's *Concilia*, vii. 1444 [in Harduin's *Concilia*, iv. 1181, &c. Tr.] The rule, as published by Lucas D'Achery, *Spicilegium veter. Scriptor.* i. 565, &c. under the name of *Chrodegang*, was the work of another person. A neat summary of the rule is given by Jac. Longueval, *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, iv. 435.

¹ See Lud. Ant. Muratori, *Antiquitates Italice Medii Ævi*, v. 185, &c. also Lud. Thomassinus, *de Disciplina Ecclesie vetere ac nova*, pt. i. l. iii. c. iv. &c. The design of this institution was truly excellent. For its author, pained with the vices and defects of the clergy, hoped that this mode of living would abstract the consecrated men from worldly cares and business. But the event has shown how much the hopes of these good men were disappointed.

² For the authority of the Greek emperors in religious matters, see Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 136.

³ Anastasius mentions this decree; which

is preserved both by Yvo and Gratian. The subject has been discussed by very many. [The existence of this council, and of such a grant to Charles, is very uncertain. The earliest mention of the council is in Sigebert's *Chronicon* (ad ann. 773), written about A.D. 1111. But the passage is not in all the copies. From this questionable authority, Gratian transcribed his account of it (*Distinct.* lxiii. c. 22, 23), and also Ivo, and the others. See Pet. de Marca, *de Concordia*, &c. l. viii. c. 13. Pagi, *Critica in Baron.* ad ann. 774. Mansi, *Concil. Supplem.* i. 721; and Walch's *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 473. Tr.]

⁴ See Jo. Mabillon, *Commentar. in Ordinem Romanum, Musæi Italici*, t. ii. p. cxiii. &c. Muratori, *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesi.* p. 87, &c.

⁵ This has been amply demonstrated by Steph. Baluze, *Præf. ad Capitularia Regum Francor.* § xxi. &c.

⁶ See Muratori, *Antiquitates Ital. Medii Ævi*, t. i. diss. ix. p. 470. Franc. de

exempted from the common burthen by special favour of the ruling powers, were taxed like other property for public purposes.¹

§ 16. That the preservation of religion, and the decision of controversies respecting doctrines, belonged to the Roman pontiff, and to ecclesiastical councils, was not denied by the Latin emperors and kings.² But this power of the pontiff was confined within narrow limits. For he was not able to decide by his sole authority, but was obliged to assemble a council. Nor did the provinces wait for his decisions, but held conventions or councils at their pleasure, in which the bishops freely expressed their opinions, and gave decisions which did not accord with the views of the pontiffs; as is manifest from the French and German councils in the controversy respecting images. Moreover, the emperors and kings had the right of calling the councils, and of presiding in them: nor could the decrees of a council have the force of laws, unless they were confirmed and ratified by the reigning sovereign.³ The Roman pontiffs, however, left no means untried to free themselves from these many restraints, and to obtain supreme authority, not only over the church, but also over kings and over the whole world: which efforts of theirs were wonderfully favoured by the disturbances and wars of the following century.

§ 17. In the writers of this age there are very few who deserve much praise, either for learning or genius. Among the Greeks, *Germanus*, bishop of Constantinople, obtained some celebrity by his talents, but still more by his immoderate zeal in defence of images.⁴ *Cosmas*, of Jerusalem, got renown by his skill in composing hymns.⁵

Roye, *de Missis Dominicis*, c. x. p. 44, c. viii. p. 118, 134, 168, 195, &c.

¹ See, especially, Muratori, *Antiq. Ital. Medii Aevi*, t. i. diss. xvii. p. 926. Also, the Collection of various pieces, in the Contest of Lewis XV. king of France, respecting the exemption of the clergy from taxation, published in Holland, in seven volumes, under the title of *Ecrits pour et contre les Immunités Prétendues par le Clergé de France, à la Haye, 1751*, 8vo. &c.

² See Charles the Great, *de Imaginibus*, l. i. c. iv. p. 48, ed. Heumann.

³ All these points are well illustrated by Baluze, *Præf. ad Capitularia*: and by the *Capitularia* themselves; that is, by the laws of the French kings. And all those who have discussed the rights of kings and princes in matters of religion, take up and illustrate this subject. See also Jac. Basnage, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, i. 270, &c.

⁴ See Richard Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiast. de M. du Pin*, tom. i. p. 270. [*Germanus* was the son of Justinian, a patrician of Constantinople, and was made a eunuch by Constantine Pogonatus. He was made bishop of Cyzicus, and then patriarch of Constantinople, from

715 to 730. During the four last years of his patriarchate he strenuously opposed the emperor Leo, and defended image worship until he was deposed. He now retired to a peaceful private life till his death, about 740, when he was more than ninety years old. His writings all relate to image worship, and the honour due to the virgin Mary; and consist of letters, orations, and polemic tracts; which may be seen in the *Acts of the second Nicene council*, the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and other collections. His orations in praise of the holy Virgin are ascribed by some to another *Germanus*, bishop of Constantinople, in the thirteenth century. See Cave's *Hist. Litt.* vol. i. *Tr.*]

⁵ [*Cosmas* was a native of Italy: captured by Saracen pirates, he was carried to Damascus, and there sold to the father of John Damascenus, who made him preceptor to his son. He was afterwards a monk in the monastery of St. Sabas, near Jerusalem; and at last bishop of Majuma. He flourished about 730, and has left us thirteen Hymns, on the principal festivals, and some other poems; which are extant only in Latin, and may be seen in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. xii. See Cave's *Hist. Litt.* vol. i. *Tr.*]

The histories of *George Syncellus*¹ and *Theophanes*² hold some rank among the writers of Byzantine history; but they must be placed far below the earlier Greek and Latin historians. The most distinguished of the Greek and Oriental writers, was *John Damascenus*, a man of respectable talents, and of some eloquence. He elucidated the Peripatetic philosophy, as well as the science of theology, by various writings; but his fine native endowments were vitiated by the faults of his times, superstition, and excessive veneration for the fathers; to say nothing of his censurable propensity, to explain the Christian doctrines conformably to the views of *Aristotle*.³

¹ [George was a monk of Constantinople, and *syncellus* to Tarasius the patriarch. A *syncellus* was a high ecclesiastical personage, the constant companion and inspector of the bishop, and resident in the *same cell* with him; whence his name *σύνκελλος*. See Du Cange, *Glossar. Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis*, sub voce *Syncellus*. The *Chronicon* of George Syncellus extends from the creation to the times of Maximin; and is copied almost verbatim from the *Chronicon* of Eusebius. Jos. Scaliger made much use of it, for recovering the lost Greek of Eusebius's work. It was published, Greek and Latin, with notes, by Jac. Goar, Paris, 1652, fol. See Cave's *Hist. Litt. t. i. Tr.*]

² [Theophanes, surnamed Isaaciuss, and Confessor, was a Constantinopolitan, of noble birth, born A. D. 758. Leo, the patrician, obliged him in his youth to marry his daughter; but his wife and he agreed to have no matrimonial intercourse; and, on the death of her father, they separated, and Theophanes became a monk. He had previously filled several important civil offices under the emperor Leo. He retired to the monastery of Polychronium, near Sigriana, A. D. 780; and thence to the island Colonymus, where he converted his paternal estate into a monastery, and spent six years. Then returning to Sigriana, he purchased the estate called *Ager*, converted it into a monastery, and presided over it as the abbot. In 787 he was called to the second Nicene council, where he strenuously defended image-worship. After 813, Leo, the Armenian, required him to condemn image-worship, which he resolutely refused to do. In 815, or a year later, he was imprisoned for his obstinacy, though now in declining health; and two years after, was banished to the island of Samothrace, where he died at the end of twenty-three days. The patrons of image-worship accounted him a *confessor*, and honoured him as a *saint*. His *Chronicon*, which embraces both the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of the Greek empire, continues that of George Syncellus, from 285 to 813. It is written in a dry style, without method, and with numerous mistakes.

The *Chronicon* of Anastasius Bibliothecarius is a mere Latin translation of this, so far as this extends. It was published, Greek and Latin, with the notes of Goar and Combes, Paris, 1655, fol. See Cave, *Hist. Litt. t. i. Tr.*]

³ See Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique*, ii. 950, and Leo Allatius's account of his writings; which Mich. le Quien has published, with the *Opera Damasceni* [ed. Paris, 1712, and Venice, 1748, 2 vols. fol.—also Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclés.* vi. 101, &c. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* viii. 772, &c.; and Schroeckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xx. 222, &c.—John Damascenus, called also Chrysorrhœas by the Greeks, on account of his eloquence, and by the Arabs, Mansur, was born at Damascus, near the end of the seventh, or beginning of the eighth century. His father, Sergius, a wealthy Christian, and privy-councillor to the khalif, redeemed many captives; and among them, a learned Italian monk, named Cosmas, whom he made preceptor to his only son John. On the decease of his father, John succeeded him in office at the Saracen court. About 728 he wrote numerous letters, in defence of image-worship, which the emperor, Leo the Isaurian, was endeavouring to suppress. This, it is said, induced Leo to forge a treasonable letter from John to himself, which he sent to the khalif, in order to compass the destruction of John. The khalif ordered his right hand to be cut off. John replaced the severed hand; and, by the intercession of the virgin Mary, had it perfectly restored the same night. This miracle convinced the khalif of John's innocence; and he offered to restore him to his office and favour; but John chose to retire to private life. He sold and gave away all his property, and repaired to the monastery of St. Sabas, near Jerusalem; where he spent the remainder of his life in composing learned works on theology and science. His treatises are numerous, consisting of Orations, Letters, and Tracts, chiefly polemic, in defence of image-worship, and against heresies; yet several are devotional and narrative. But few of his philosophical works have been pub-

§ 18. At the head of the Latin writers stands *Charles the Great*, the emperor, who was a great lover of learning. To him are ascribed the laws called *Capitulars*, some *Epistles*, the *Books concerning images*, and other things; although there can be little doubt that he generally used another's pen and head.¹ Next to him should be placed *Bede*, called the *Venerable*, on account of his virtues;²

lished. His great work is, *de Fide Orthodoxa*, libri iv. (Ἐκδόσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως), which is a complete system of theology derived from the fathers, and arranged in the manner of the schoolmen. *Tr.*—Oudin says that John Damascene seems to him the first of the Greek fathers who spoke of the Eucharist as *the true body and blood of Christ*, the universal usage of his predecessors being to speak of it as an *antitype*, or *symbol and figure of Christ's body and blood*. *De Scriptt. Eccl.* i. 1717. S.]

¹ See Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Medii Ævi Latina*, i. 936. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 368. [Charles was not only a great general and statesman, but likewise a great promoter of learning. He possessed talents of no ordinary character; and though his very active life left him little time for study, he was a considerable proficient in all the branches of knowledge then generally pursued. He understood both Latin and Greek, was well read in civil history, and was no contemptible theologian. Eginhard indeed tells us he could never learn to write; having not undertaken it till too far advanced in life. But if he could not write a fair hand, he could dictate to his amanuenses; and by their aid, and that of the learned men whom he always had about him, he composed and compiled very much that does him great credit. Besides a great number of *Diplomas*, *Deeds*, and *Grants*, which are to be seen in various collections; as those of Canisius, Duchesne, D'Achery, Mabillon, &c.; and numerous *Letters*, interspersed in the later collections of councils; he wrote a *Preface* to the book of Homilies for all the festivals of the year, which Paul Diaconus compiled by his order; also a large part of the *Edicts*, chiefly in relation to ecclesiastical affairs, which are denominated his *Capitularia*. Of these, the first four books, entitled, *Capitularia, sive Edicta Caroli Magni et Ludovici Pii*, were collected by the abbot Ansegisus, A. D. 827. Afterwards, three books more were collected by Benedict Levita. The whole are best published by Baluze, Paris, 1677, 2 vols. fol. The *Codex Carolinus* is a collection of ninety-nine Epistles of successive popes to him, and to his father and grandfather, with theirs to the popes; made by order of Charles, A. D. 791. This was published by Gretser, Ingolst. 1613, 4to.—The four books against image-worship (*de Imagini-*

bus), called also the *Capitulare Prolixum*, if not dictated entirely by him, were at least drawn up in his name, by his order, and in accordance with his views. He caused it to be read in the council of Frankfort, A. D. 794, where it was approved; and he then sent a copy of it to pope Hadrian, who replied to it, as being the work of Charles. It was first published by John Tillet (Tilius), afterwards bishop of Meaux, A. D. 1549; and last, by C. A. Heumann, Hanover, 1731, 8vo. For the genuineness of this work, see Schroeckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xx. 583, &c.; and Cave, *Hist. Litt.* t. i. *Tr.*—The materials for the celebrated treatise upon images appear to have been really supplied by Alcuin, though the work was published under the name and by the authority of his imperial master. The deuterio-Nicene decrees in favour of image-worship had been received with execration in England; but as the country was in deferential amity with Rome, the indignant repulse was treated as if bestowed upon a corruption merely oriental; and Alcuin was chosen by his countrymen for the delicate task of justifying their conduct at the papal court. He produced, accordingly, an *Epistle*, which gained unqualified applause. This was, probably, the base of that publication which Charlemagne adopted, if not the work itself. The emperor's own subjects had no more respect for image-worship than Alcuin's countrymen. For further information, see *the Life of Alcuin*, by Lorenz. Engl. transl. p. 119; and Soames's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 172; and *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 120. S.]

² Concerning Bede, see the *Acta Sanctorum*. April 1, 866. *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique Crit.* i. 178. A catalogue of his writings, drawn up by himself, is extant in Muratori's *Antiquitates Italice*. *Medii Ævi*, iii. 825, &c. [Beda or Bedan (as St. Boniface calls him), was born at Jarrow, near the mouth of the Tyne, in Northumberland, and within the territories of the monastery of St. Peter, in that place. At the age of seven years, he was sent to that monastery for education; and afterwards removed to the neighbouring monastery of St. Paul. In these two monasteries he spent his whole life, except occasionally visiting other monasteries for literary purposes. At the age of nineteen, he was ordained a deacon, and, at the age of thirty, a presbyter. He was a most dili-

Alcuin, the preceptor of *Charles the Great*;¹ and *Paulinus*, of *Aquila*;² all of whom were distinguished for industry and zeal for learning.

gent student; yet punctual in observing the discipline of his monastery, and attending its devotional exercises. At the age of thirty, he began to write, and became one of the most voluminous writers of that age. His works, published at Cologne, 1612, and again 1688, fill eight vols. fol. They consist of Commentaries on the greater part of the Old Testament, and the whole of the New; numerous Homilies and Letters; a large number of Tracts; and an ecclesiastical history of Great Britain, from the invasion of Julius Cæsar to 731. Bede was a man of great learning for that age; of considerable genius; and an agreeable writer. Yet his Commentaries and theological Tracts are little more than compilations from the fathers. As an historian, he was honest, but credulous; as a divine, he was a mere copyist; following Augustine, Gregory the Great and the more sound Greek fathers. His piety stands unquestioned. His only work, now of much value, is his church history, in five books, edited by Wheloc, Cambridge, 1644; and still better, by Smith, *ibid.* 1722, fol.—See Bede's account of his own life and writings; in his *H. E.* iv. 2; also Cave's *Hist. Litt.* tom. i. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* iii. 500—524, ed. Venice, 1734; and J. Milner's *Church History*, cent. viii. ch. i. Tr.—A new edition of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* was published in 8vo, with useful English notes, by the *Eng. Historical Society*, in 1838, under the judicious care of Mr. Jos. Stevenson. [And still better ones by Petrie in the *Mon. Hist. Brit.* Lond. 1848, and by R. Hussey, Oxf. 1846. Ed.] The historian should not be too hastily taxed with credulity. His work does, indeed, contain some such tales as bespeak the age, but he merely details what was currently believed, and seems himself to have been really rather behind the prevailing standard of credulity. A new edition of Bede's works is now published by Dr. Giles; who has made a discovery among the MS. treasures of the public library of Boulogne-sur-Mer, which can scarcely fail of presenting the venerable Anglo-Saxon's homilies in a far more trustworthy form than the press has hitherto produced them. S.]

Préface, p. x. [But this edition, it appears, was never published; and that of Du Chesne, Paris, 1617, fol. continued to be used. Flaccus Alcuin, Alchwin, or Albin, was a native of York, and educated in the episcopal school there. He was well acquainted with Latin and Greek, and, some say, had a knowledge of Hebrew. He was a man of learning and genius, of sound judgment, and of good taste. As an orator, poet, philosopher, and theologian, he was, perhaps, the most distinguished man of his age. His writings consist chiefly of expositions of the scriptures, letters, and treatises on theology and science. His expositions, like those of Bede, are little more than compilations from the fathers, particularly from Augustine. His letters are numerous, well written, and useful for elucidating the history of his times. His elaborate confutation of Elipandus is now little read. Being sent by his bishop to Rome, Charles the Great met with him, and became so pleased with him, that he allured him to his court, about 780, made him his preceptor, and counsellor; employed him to confute the errorists Felix and Elipandus; and committed to his care, not only the palatine school, but several monasteries; and particularly that of St. Martin of Tours. To this monastery he retired, A. D. 790, then advanced in years; there he established a school, after the model of that at York, and spent the remainder of his days in high reputation as a scholar, and a devout Christian. See Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* v. 138—180; and Cave, *Hist. Littér.* t. i. Tr.—Alcuin died at Tours, in 804, on Whitsunday, being then about 70. He was decidedly the first literary man of his age, and may be considered as the founder of an improved continental school of theology. Rather, perhaps, he transplanted from his own country a higher degree of knowledge than had been recently possessed by the neighbouring nations. From the foreign ornaments of this school have been supplied an invaluable chain of testimonies against transubstantiation. The best edition of Alcuin's works is that by Froben, prince abbot of St. Emeram's at Ratisbon, published in 1777, in 2 vols. fol. But it is considered that English public libraries which contain many MS. pieces by Alcuin might furnish means for another edition still better. To Froben's edition is prefixed the most complete and learned account of Alcuin's life. S.]

² See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 286. *Acta Sanctor.* Januar. i. 713. [Paulinus is

Nor can one doubt, from their mode of treating almost every branch of learning then cultivated, that it was not the want of genius, but the state of the times, which prevented them from attaining greater eminence. If to these we add *Boniface*, who has been already mentioned;¹ *Eginhard*, the celebrated author of a biography of Charles the Great, and of other works;² *Paul*, the Deacon, known to after-ages by his *History of the Lombards*, *Historia Miscella*, *Homiliarium*, and some other works;³ *Ambrose Authpert*, who expounded the Apocalypse of St. John;⁴ and *Theodulphus* of Orleans;⁵

said to have been a native of Austria, now Friuli, and a celebrated grammarian. Charles the Great raised him to affluence, and then made him archbishop of Aquileia in 776. From 793 to 799, in connexion with Alcuin, he was very active in opposing and confuting the errors of Felix and Elipandus, and made a considerable figure in the councils of Frankfort, and Forum Julii. He enjoyed the confidence of Charles, and the respect of his contemporaries, and died A. D. 804. His works are nearly all polemic, and opposed to the Adoptionists; namely, a Tract on the Trinity, against Elipandus; three books against Felix: with several epistles, and a few poems. They were published at Venice, 1737, fol. See Cave, *Hist. Litt. t. i. Tr.*

¹ [See above, pt. i. c. 1, § 2, note. *Tr.*]

² [Eginhard, or Einhard, was a German of Franconia, educated in the court of Charles the Great, made tutor to his sons, chaplain, privy-councillor, and private secretary to the emperor. He was also overseer of the royal buildings at Aix-la-Chapelle. Whether his wife Emma, or Imma, was the natural daughter of Charles, has been questioned. After she had borne him one child, they mutually agreed to separate, and betake themselves to monasteries. Charles made Eginhard his ambassador to Rome in 806. In 816, he became abbot of Fontanelle; and the next year Lewis the Pious committed his son Lothaire to his instruction. In 819, he became the abbot of Ghent; and in 826, abbot of Seligenstadt, where he died about A. D. 840. He was a fine scholar; and as an historian, the first in his age. Besides sixty-two epistles, and several tracts, he wrote the Life of Charles, which has been compared with Suetonius' Cæsars for elegance; also Annals of the reigns of Pipin, Charles, and Lewis the Pious, from 741 to 829. The best edition of his works is that of J. H. Schminke, Utrecht, 1711, 4to. See Cave, *Hist. Litt. t. ii.* and Schroeckh, *Kirchen-gesch. xxii. 150, &c. Tr.*]

³ [Paul Warnefrid, or Diaconus, a Lombard by birth, and deacon of the church of Aquileia, was private secretary to Desiderius, king of the Lombards.—When that

nation was conquered by Charles, A. D. 774, Paul was sent prisoner to France; afterwards, being suspected of favouring the disaffected Lombards, he retired to the south of Italy, and became a monk at mount Cassino, where he ended his days, some time in the following century. His history of the Lombards, in six books, is of considerable value. His *Historia Miscella*, in twenty-four books, is meagre. The first ten books are those of Eutropius, with some interpolations. The next six were composed by Paul; and the remainder by some writer of even less value. His *Homiliarium*, or Collection of Homilies for all the Sundays and holy days of the year, in 2 vols. 4to, was compiled (not by Alcuin, as some suppose, but by Paul) by direction of Charles; and was intended to afford to preachers, who could not frame discourses, some that they might read to their congregations. The collection is made from Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Origen, Leo, Gregory, Maximus, Beda, &c. Some discourses were added to it after the death of Paul. He also wrote the life of St. Benedict, and biographies of several other saints. See Cave, *Hist. Litt. t. i.* and Bellarmin, *Scriptores Ecclesiast. ed. Venice, 1728, fol. p. 253, &c. Tr.*]

⁴ [Ambrose Authpert, or Autpert, was a native of France, and became abbot of St. Vincent, in Abruzzo, Italy, about A. D. 760. He must not be confounded with an abbot of mount Cassino, of the same name, who lived in the ninth century. To him has been attributed the work entitled, the Conflicts of the Vices and Virtues, published among the works of Augustine, and also of Ambrose of Milan, and likewise some other pieces. But his great work is his Commentary on the Apocalypse, in ten books. See Cave, *Hist. Litt. t. i.* and Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. iv. 234, &c. Tr.*]

⁵ [Theodulphus, an Italian, whom Charles the Great patronised. He first made him abbot of Fleury, and then bishop of Orleans about A. D. 794. Lewis the Pious greatly esteemed him, employed him much at his court, and sent him as his envoy to the pope. But in the year 818, being suspected of treasonable acts, he was deposed, and confined to the monastery of

we have nearly all the writers of any merit who cultivated either sacred or profane learning.¹

Angers. He died about A.D. 821. He wrote tolerable poetry; namely, *Carminum ad diversos*, libri vi.; besides *Poemata* x. His prose is inferior to his poetry: consisting of forty-six Canons for his diocese; a Tract on Baptism; and another on the Holy Spirit. Most of the preceding were published by Jac. Sirmond, Paris, 1646, 8vo. There is still extant an elegant MS. Bible, which he caused to be written, and to which he prefixed a preface, and some poems, in golden letters. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* t. i. and Bellarmin, *Scriptores Ecclesiast.* p. 281, &c. Tr.]

¹ [Among the *Greek writers*, omitted by Mosheim, were the following:—

John, patriarch of Constantinople, under Philippicus Bardanes, the Monothelite, A.D. 712—715. Being deposed after the death of Philippicus, he wrote an Epistle to the pope, purging himself of the Monothelite heresy, which is printed in the *Concilia*.

Anastasius, abbot of St. Euthymius, in Palestine; against whom John Damascenus wrote an epistle; flourished A.D. 741. He is the author of a Tract against the Jews; published in a translation by Canisius, *Lectt. Antiq.* t. iii. and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. xiii.

Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople. He was of noble birth, and privy-councillor to the emperor, when the empress Irene, A.D. 785, raised him to the see of Constantinople, and employed him to restore image-worship in the East. He presided in the second Nicene council, A.D. 787; and wrote several letters, extant in the *Concilia*. He died A.D. 806.

Basil, bishop of Ancyra, a recanter in the second Nicene council, A.D. 787. His recantation, for having opposed image-worship, is published in the *Concilia*.

Elias, metropolitan of Crete, flourished A.D. 787. He wrote Commentaries on Gregory Nazianzen's Orations, still extant in a Latin translation; Answers to questions on cases of conscience, by Dionysius; extant, Gr. and Lat. His exposition of the Scala of John Climax, is said still to exist in MS.

The *Latin writers*, omitted by Mosheim, are much more numerous. Acca, a celebrated English monk of York, who flourished A.D. 705—740, and was an intimate of Bede. He accompanied St. Wilfrid to Rome, became bishop of Hexham (Hagustald) in Northumberland; and wrote lives of the saints of his diocese, several letters, &c.

John VII., pope A.D. 705—707; has left us one epistle, addressed to Ethelred, king of Mercia, and Alfrid, king of Deira, re-

specting Wilfrid, bishop of York; in the *Concilia*. [Jaffé, 173. *Ed.*]

Constantine, pope A.D. 708—715; was called to Constantinople, A.D. 710, by the emperor, and treated with great respect. His Epistle to Brihtwald, archbishop of Canterbury, is extant in the *Concilia*. [Jaffé, 173. *Ed.*]

Gregory II., pope A.D. 715—731; famous for his opposition to Leo III. the emperor, who endeavoured to suppress image-worship. He has left us fifteen Epistles, published in the *Concilia*. In his pontificate, the *Liber Diurnus*, containing the ancient forms of proceeding in the church of Rome, is supposed to have been compiled. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 620, &c. [Jaffé, 175. *Ed.*]

Felix, an English monk, who flourished A.D. 715, was a writer of some distinction. His life of St. Guthlac, the anchorite of Croyland, is above the ordinary level of the legends of that age. It is in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor.* iii. 256, &c.

Heddius, surnamed Stephen, an English presbyter and monk, well skilled in church music. He is said to have died about 720. Wilfrid, archbishop of York, invited him from Canterbury, to instruct his clergy in singing. He composed an elaborate life of archbishop Wilfrid, which is in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor.* v. 631—709. Also by Gale in the *XV. Scriptores*, Oxf. 1691. It occupies forty pages. S.]

Gregory III., pope A.D. 731—741. He pursued the contest, begun by his predecessor, against the emperor Leo III.; and also invited Charles Martel to aid him against the king of the Lombards. He has left us seven Epistles, and a Collection from the ancient canons; which are extant in Harduin's *Concilia*. [Jaffé, 180. *Ed.*]

Cuthbert, an English monk of [Jarrow], a disciple and intimate of Bede. He wrote the life of Bede; some letters, &c.

Zacharias, a Syrian monk, and pope, A.D. 741—752. He has left us eighteen Epistles; and a Greek translation of St. Gregory's Dialogues. [Jaffé, 184. *Ed.*]

Chrodegand, Chrodegang, or Rodegang, a Frank, of noble birth, educated in the court of Charles Martel, and bishop of Metz from A.D. 742 to 766. He first composed rules for regular canons. See § 14 of this chapter, and note.

Willibald, an English monk, traveller, and bishop of Eichstadt in Germany. He was an assistant of St. Boniface, and wrote his life. See pt. l. c. 1. § 5, note.

Stephen III., pope A.D. 753—757, has left us six Epistles, extant in the *Collections of Councils*. [Jaffé, 189. *Ed.*]

Isidorus, bishop of Badajoz (Pacensis), in-

Spain; flourished A.D. 754. He continued Idacius' supplement to Jerome's *Chronicon*, from A.D. 609 to A.D. 754.

Paul I., pope A.D. 757—767. Twelve Epistles, ascribed to him, are extant in the *Collections of Councils*. [Jaffé, 193. *Ed.*]

Aribo, bishop of Freising, A.D. 760—783. He was a monk, educated by St. Corbinian; whose successor and biographer he was. See Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor*. iii. 470, and Meichelbeck's *Hist. Frisingens.* i. 61, &c.

Florus, a monk of St. Trond, in the diocese of Liege, who flourished about 760, and enlarged Bede's *Martyrologium*.

Godescalc, a deacon and canon of Liege, who flourished about 780, and wrote the life of St. Lambert, bishop of Liege in this century. It is extant in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor*. &c. iii. 59, &c.

Stephen IV., pope A.D. 768—772, has left us three Epistles, and some Decrees. [Jaffé, 200. *Ed.*]

Hadrian, or Adrian I., pope A.D. 772—795, has left us eighteen Epistles; an Epitome of Ecclesiastical Canons, addressed to Charles the Great; a collection of canons for the use of Ingilram, a bishop; and a

letter in confutation of Charles's books against image-worship. [Jaffé, 203. *Ed.*]

Donatus, a deacon of Metz, about 790, who wrote the life of St. Trudo, or Trond; extant in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor*. ii. 1022, &c.

Etherius, or Heterius, bishop of Osma, in Spain, and Beatus, a Spanish presbyter in Asturias, distinguished themselves by their opposition to the error of Elipandus, which they endeavoured to confute, in a work still extant, in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, t. xiii.

Leo III., pope A.D. 795—816; has left us thirteen Epistles. [Jaffé, 215. *Ed.*]

Leidradus, or Leidrachus, archbishop of Lyons, A.D. 798—813; was twice sent into Spain by Charles, to reclaim Felix and Elipandus. He has left us three Epistles, and a Tract on Baptism.

Jesse, or Jessæus, or Tesse, bishop of Amiens, A.D. 799—834; was much employed in embassies, and in civil affairs, by Charles and his successors. He wrote a long Epistle to his clergy, concerning sacred rites, particularly in relation to baptism; still extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. The Christian doctrine corrupted — § 2. The piety and morals of this age — § 3. Exegetical theology — § 4. Charles the Great's zeal for sacred learning — § 5. It led to neglect of the Bible — § 6. Manner of treating didactic theology — § 7. Practical theology — § 8. Polemic theology — § 9. Origin of the controversy about images — § 10. Progress of it under Leo the Isaurian — § 11. Conflicts of the image-worshippers with the Iconoclasts — § 12. Progress under Copronymus — § 13. Under Irene — § 14. Council of Frankfort — § 15. Controversy respecting the procession of the Holy Spirit.

§ 1. THE fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion were preserved both by the Greek and the Latin writers. This will appear unquestionable to one who shall inspect the work of *John Damascenus* among the Greeks, *on the orthodox faith*; and the *profession of faith* by *Charles the Great*, among the Latins.¹ But to this pure seed of the word, more tares were added than can be well imagined.

¹ See Charles's Treatise *de Imaginibus*, l. iii. p. 259, ed. Heumann. Add, from among the Greeks, the *Profession of Faith*, by Mich. Syncellus, published by Bernh. de Montfaucon, in the *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 90, &c.—From among the Latins, an *Exposi-*

tion of the principal doctrines of religion, by Benedict of Aniane, in Stephen Baluze's *Miscellanies*, v. 56, and the Creed of Leo III. which he sent into the East; also in Baluze, vii. 18.

The very nature of religion, and the true worship of God, were corrupted, by those who contended for image-worship, and for similar institutions, with such fierceness as excluded all charity. The efficacy of the merits of our Saviour, all acknowledged; and yet all tacitly depreciated them, by maintaining that men can appease God, either by undergoing voluntary punishments, or by offering him gifts and presents; and by directing those who were anxious about their salvation, to place confidence in the works of holy men. To explain the other defects and superstitions of the times, would carry us beyond the limits prescribed in this work.

§ 2. The whole religion or piety of this, and of some subsequent centuries, consisted in founding, enriching, embellishing, and enlarging churches and chapels; in hunting after and venerating the relics of holy men; in securing the patronage with God of individuals in heaven, by gifts and superstitious rites and ceremonies; in worshipping the images and statues of saints; in performing pilgrimages to holy places, especially to Palestine;¹ and in like practices. In these services, which were supposed to have the greatest efficacy in procuring salvation, the virtuous and good were equally zealous with the vicious and profligate; the latter, that they might cancel their crimes and wickedness; the former, that they might obtain earthly blessings from God, and secure a more ready admission to heavenly bliss. The true religion of Jesus Christ, if we except a few dogmas contained in their creeds, was wholly unknown in this age, even to the teachers of the highest rank: and all orders of society from the highest to the lowest, neglecting the duties of true piety, and the renovation of the heart, fearlessly gave themselves up to every vice and crime, supposing that God could easily be appeased and become reconciled to them by the intercessions and prayers of the saints, and by the friendly offices of the priests, the ministers of God. The whole history of these times avouches the truth of these remarks.²

§ 3. The Greeks thought the sacred volume to have been explained sufficiently well by their forefathers. Hence biblical students were considered as effectually served by extracts collected from ancient writers who had commented upon Scripture, whether well or ill. How judiciously this was done, will appear, among other works, from the Commentary of *John Damascenus* on St. Paul's epistles compiled from *Chrysostom*. The Latin interpreters are of two classes. Some, like the Greeks, collect in one body the interpretations of the ancients.

¹ [Such pilgrimages were likewise made to Rome; and they were called *pilgrimages for Christ*, and the performers of them, *Pilgrims of St. Peter*. Many disorders attended these pilgrimages. Hence Boniface, in a letter to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury (to be found among the Acts of the council of Cloveshoo, in England, A.D. 747), desired, that women and nuns might be restrained from their frequent pilgrimages to Rome; alleging this reason: 'Quia magna

ex parte pereunt, paucis remanentibus integris. Perpaucæ enim sunt civitates in Longobardia, vel in Francia, aut in Gallia, in quibus non sit adultera vel meretrix generis Anglorum; quod scandalum est et turpitudine totius ecclesiæ vestræ.' See Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 1950. *Schl.*]

² [This very harsh judgment of Mosheim will be repudiated by all who will read the History of Bede, *Ed.*]

One of these was *Bede*, who took this course in an exposition of St. Paul's epistles, which he drew from *Augustine* and others.¹ The other class made trial of their own skill in expounding the sacred volume; and among these, *Alcuin*, *Bede*, *Ambrose Authpert* (the interpreter of the Apocalypse), and a few more, stand conspicuous. But these lack the ability requisite for this business; and neglecting altogether the true import of the words, hunt after recondite meanings which they distribute into the *allegorical*, the *anagogical*, and the *tropological*;² that is, they tell us, not what the inspired writers *say*, but what they vainly suspect those writers would *signify* to us. As examples, we may name *Alcuin's* Commentary on John, *Bede's* allegorical Explanations of the Books of Samuel, and *Charles the Great's* Book on Images, in which various passages of Scripture are expounded, according to the customs of the age.³

§ 4. *Charles's* reverence for the sacred volume was so great,⁴ that it went beyond due bounds; and led him to believe, the fundamental principles of all arts and sciences to be contained in the Bible; a sentiment which he imbibed, undoubtedly, from *Alcuin*, and the other divines whom he was accustomed to hear.⁵ Hence originated his various efforts to excite the clergy to a more diligent investigation and explanation of the sacred books. Laws, enacted by him for this purpose, are still extant; and there are other proofs that no subject was nearer to his heart.⁶ That errors in copies of the Latin translation might be no obstacle to his designs, he employed *Alcuin* to pick them out and correct them;⁷ nay, he himself spent some time, during the last years of his life, upon their correction.⁸ There are those who tell us also, that he procured a translation of the sacred books into German: but others attribute this to his son, *Lewis the Pious*.⁹

§ 5. These efforts of the emperor, were effective to awaken exertion in some of the slothful and indolent. Yet it must be admitted that he inadvertently adopted regulations and plans which defeated, in part, his excellent purposes. In the first place, he sanctioned the practice which had prevailed before his day, of reading and expounding only certain portions of the sacred volume in the assemblies of worship; and the diverse customs of the different churches he endeavoured to reduce to one uniform standard.¹⁰ In the next place, knowing that

¹ On the Commentaries of Bede, see Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiastique de M. du Pin*, i. 280, &c. See also his Exposition of Genesis, derived from the fathers; in Martene's *Thesaurus Anecdotor.* v. 111, 116, 140; and the Interpretation of Habakkuk; *ibid.* 295, &c.

² See Charles the Great, *de Imaginibus*, lib. i. p. 138.

³ See Charles, *de Imag.* l. i. p. 84, 91, 123, 127, 131, 133, 136, 138, 145, 160, 164, 165, &c. *passim*.

⁴ *Idem*, *de Imagin.* l. i. p. 44.

⁵ *Idem*, *de Imagin.* l. i. p. 231, 236.

⁶ See Jo. Frick, *de Canone Scriptur.* S. p. 184.

⁷ *Cæsar Baronius, Annales*, ad. ann. 778, § 27, &c. Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. Mediæ Evæ*, i. 137. *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, iv. 300.

⁸ Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. Mediæ Evæ*, i. 950, &c. Jac. Ussher, *de Sacris et Scripturis Vernaculis*, p. 110, &c. [See also Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch.* xx. 196, &c. *Tr.*]

⁹ [See Du Chesne, *Scriptores Hist. Franc.* ii. 326. *Tr.*]

¹⁰ It must be acknowledged, that it is a mistake to suppose the emperor Charles to have first selected those portions of the sacred volume, which are still read and expounded, every year, in the assemblies of Christians. For it appears, that in preced-

few of the clergy were competent to explain the *Gospels* and *Epistles*, as the lessons were called; he directed *Paul the Deacon*, and *Alcuin*, to collect *Homilies*, or discourses on them, out of the fathers; so that the ignorant and slothful teachers might recite them to the people. This was the origin of what is called his *Homiliarium*, or *Book of Homilies*.¹ And his example led others, in this and the next age, to compile at their own pleasure similar works, for the encouragement of laziness among the teachers.² Lastly, he caused the lives of the most eminent saints to be collected into a volume; so that the people might have, in the dead, examples worthy of imitation, while they had none among the living. That all these regulations proceeded from honest and good intentions, and, indeed, that they were useful in that age, no one can doubt. But still, contrary to the intentions of the emperor, they contributed not a little to confirm the intolerance of the public teachers, and to increase neglect of the sacred volume. For, from this time onward, most of the clergy directed their attention exclusively to those portions of the Bible, which were to be expounded to the people; and did not exercise themselves in reading and examining the whole volume of Scripture; and not many were to be found who were inclined to compose their own public discourses, rather than resort to their *Homiliarium*.

§ 6. The business of discussing formally and systematically the doctrines of Christianity, was scarcely attempted by any one of the Latins. For the essays of some few, respecting the person and

ing centuries, in most of the Latin churches, certain portions of the inspired books were assigned to the several days for public worship. See Jo. Hen. Thamer, *Schediasma de Origine et Dignitate Pericoparum, quæ Evangelia et Epistolæ vulgo vocantur*; which has been several times printed. Also, Jo. Fr. Buddeus, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, ii. 1640, &c. [1426, &c.] Yet Charles had something to do in this matter. For whereas before his time the Latin churches differed, or did not all read and expound the same portions of the Bible; he first ordained, that all the churches, throughout his dominions, should conform to the custom of the Roman church. For those *Gospels* and *Epistles*, as they are called, which have been expounded in public worship, from his times to the present, were used at Rome, as early as the sixth century: and it is well known that Charles took pains to render the Roman form of worship the common form of all the Latins. And hence, down to this day, those churches which have not adopted the Romish rites, use for lessons other *Gospels* and *Epistles* than those of ours, and the other Western churches, which Charles commanded to conform. The church of Milan is an example, which retains the Ambrosian ritual; likewise the church of Chur (Curia), according to Muratori, *Antiquitates Ital.* iv. 836,

and, undoubtedly, some others. What *Gospels* and *Epistles* were used by the French and other Western churches, before the times of Charles, may be learned from the ancient *Kalendar*, published by Martene (among others), *Thesaurus Anecdotor.* v. 66 — and from Bede's discourses, *ibid.* v. 339, &c., from Mabillon, *de Antiqua Liturgia Gallicana*; and from others. See also Wm. Peyrat, *Antiquitez de la Chapelle du Roi de France*, p. 566.

¹ See, concerning this, the very laborious and learned Jo. Henr. a Seelen, *Selecta Litteraria*, p. 252.

² Halanus, or Alanus, for example, an Italian abbot of Farfa, compiled, in this same century, a huge *Homiliarium*; the preface to which was published by Bernh. Pez, *Thesaur. Anecdotor.* t. vi. pt. i. p. 83. In the next century, Haymo of Hallesworth made up a *Homiliarium*; which has been printed. In the same century, Rabanus Maurus, at the request of the emperor Lothair, formed a *Homiliarium*; and likewise Hericus, mentioned by Pez, *ubi supra*, p. 93. All these made use of the Latin language. The first that composed a German *Homiliarium*, I suppose, was the celebrated Otfrid of Weissenburg. See Lambecius, *de Bibliotheca Vindobon. Augusta*, t. ii. c. v. p. 419.

natures of Christ, against *Felix* and *Elipandus*, and concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, and other things, exhibit no specimens of thorough investigation. The whole theology of the Latins, in this century, consisted in collecting opinions and testimonies out of the *Fathers*, that is, the theologians of the first six centuries; nor did any one venture to go beyond such things as had their authority, or rely upon his own understanding. Among the *Irish* only, who were denominated *Scots* in this age, some discerning ones employed philosophy in the explanation of religious doctrines,¹ a practice abhorred by others. But among the Greeks, *John Damascenus*, in his *four Books on the orthodox faith*, embraced the entire theology of Christians in a systematic form. In this work the two kinds of theology, which the Latins call *scholastic* and *dogmatic*, were united. For the author uses subtle ratiocination in explaining doctrines, and confirms them by the authority of the fathers. This work was received by the Greeks with great applause; and gradually acquired such influence, that it was regarded among them as the only guide to true theology. Yet many have complained, that the author relies more upon human reason and upon the fidelity of earlier writers than upon the Holy Scriptures, and that he thus subverts the true grounds of theology.² To this work must be added his *Sacred Parallels*, in which he carefully collects the opinions of the ancient doctors respecting the articles of faith. We may therefore look upon this writer as the *Thomas* and the *Lombard* of the Greeks.³

¹ I was aware, that Irishmen, who in that age were called *Scotchmen*, cultivated and amassed learning, beyond the other nations of Europe, in those dark times; that they travelled over various countries of Europe, for the purpose of learning, but still more for that of teaching; and that, in this century and the following, Irishmen or Scots, were to be met with, every where, in France, Germany, and Italy, discharging the functions of teachers, with applause. But I was long ignorant, that Irishmen were also the first who taught *scholastic theology* in Europe; and that so early as this century, they applied philosophy to the explanation of the Christian religion. The fact I learned first from Benedict of Aniane; some of whose short pieces are published by Stephen Baluze, *Miscellaneor.* t. v. He says, in his *Epist. to Guarnarius*, p. 54, *Apud modernos scholasticos* (i. e. teachers of schools), *maxime apud Scotos* (who held the first rank among school teachers), *est syllogismus delusionis ut dicant, Trinitatem, sicut personarum, ita esse substantiarum* (by a syllogism, which Benedict here calls *delusive*, i. e. sophistical and fallacious, these Irishmen proved the Persons in the Godhead to be substances; but the syllogism was a very captious one, as appears from what follows, and brought the inexperienced into difficulties); *quatenus*

si adsenserit illectus auditor, trinitatem esse trium substantiarum Deum, trium derogetur cultor Deorum: si autem abnuerit, personarum denegator culpetur. That is, these philosophic theologians perplexed and troubled their hearers, with this syllogism. If any one assented to their reasoning, they accused him of *tritheism*; if he rejected it, they taxed him with *Sabellianism*. Either grant, that the three Persons in God are three substances, or deny it. If you grant it, you doubtless are a *tritheist*, and worship three Gods; if you deny it, you destroy the Persons, and fall into *Sabellianism*. Benedict strongly reprehends this subtlety, in theological discussions; and recommends the love of simplicity. *Sed hæc de fide et omnis calliditatis versutia simplicitate fidei catholice est puritate vitanda, non captiosa interjectione linguarum, scæva impactione interpolanda.* The philosophic, or *Scholastic*, theology, is therefore much more ancient, among the Latins, than is commonly supposed.

² Jo. Henr. Hottinger, *Bibliothecar. Quadripart.* lib. iii. cap. ii. § iii. p. 372. Martin Chemnitz, *de Usu et Utilitate Locor. Commun.* p. 26.

³ [Thomas Aquinas and Peter Lombard. S.]

§ 7. Instructions for a Christian life and its duties, no author systematically framed. *John Carpathius*, among the Greeks, left some *hortatory discourses*,¹ containing little that deserves much commendation. In monasteries nothing was approved but opinions of the mystics, and of their father, *Dionysius the Areopagite*, whose work, accordingly, was translated by *John Darensis*, a Syriac writer, in order to gratify the monks.² The Latins proceeded no further, than to advance some precepts concerning vices and virtues, and external actions: and in explaining these, they kept near to the principles of the Peripatetics, as may be seen in some tracts of *Bede*, and in *Alcuin's* little work *on the virtues and vices*.³ To exhibit examples of piety before the public, several considerable men, as *Bede*, *Florus*, *Alcuin*, *Marcellinus*, and *Ambrose Authpert*, composed biographies of persons who had left high reputations for piety.

§ 8. Only a moderate number, in this age, entered into controversies on important religious subjects; and, among these, there is hardly an individual who merits commendation. Most of the Greek polemics engaged in the contest about images; which they managed unskillfully, and without precision. The Latins entered less into this controversy; and expended more effort in confuting the opinion of *Elipandus*, concerning the person of *Christ*. *John Damascenus* assailed all the heretics, in a tract, small, indeed, but still not useless. He also contended, resolutely, against the Manichæans and Nestorians in particular; nor did he decline to attack the Saracens. In these writings of his, there is some ingenuity and subtlety, but a want of clearness and simplicity. *Anastasius*, an abbot of Palestine, attempted a confutation of the Jews.

§ 9. Of the controversies that disquieted this age, the greatest and most pernicious related to the worship of sacred images. Originating in Greece, it thence spread over the East and the West, producing great harm both to the state and to the church. The first sparks of it appeared under *Philippicus Bardanes*, who was emperor of the Greeks near the beginning of this century. With the consent of the patriarch *John*, in the year 712, he removed from the portico of the church of St. Sophia, a picture representing the sixth general council, which condemned the Monothelites, whom the emperor was disposed to favour; and he sent his mandate to Rome, requiring all such pictures to be removed out of the churches. But *Constantine*, the Roman pontiff, not only protested against the emperor's edict, but likewise caused pictures of all the six general councils to be placed in the portico of St. Peter's church; and moreover, having assembled a council at Rome, he caused the emperor himself to be condemned, as an apostate from the true religion. These first commotions, however, terminated the next year, when the emperor was hurled from the throne.⁴

¹ *Hortatoria capita*.

² Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental.* ii. 1218.

Vatican, ii. 120.

³ It is extant in his Works, ed. Du Chesne,

⁴ See Fred. Spanheim, *Historia Imaginum*

§ 10. Under *Leo* the Isaurian, a very resolute emperor, another conflict ensued, which was far more formidable, grave, and lasting. Unable to bear the incredible superstition of the Greeks, in honouring sacred images, which Saracens and Jews laughed at, *Leo* issued an edict in the year 726, for the complete extirpation of so great an evil. By this he ordered all images of saints, excepting that of Christ on the cross, to be removed out of churches; and the worship of them to be wholly discontinued and abrogated. In this proceeding, the emperor obeyed the dictates of his own feelings, which were naturally strong and precipitate, rather than the suggestions of prudence, which recommends the extirpation of inveterate superstitions gradually and insensibly. Hence a civil war broke out; first in the islands of the Archipelago, and a part of Asia; and afterwards in Italy. For the people, either spontaneously, or under instigation of the priests and monks, who found images a source of gain, considered the emperor as an apostate from true religion; and therefore thought themselves freed from their oath of allegiance, and from the duty of obeying him.

§ 11. In Italy, the Roman pontiffs, *Gregory II.* and *Gregory III.*, were the principal authors of a revolt. The former of these pontiffs, when *Leo* would not at his bidding revoke the edicts against images, did not hesitate to say, that the emperor, in his view, had rendered himself unworthy of the name and the privileges of a true Christian.

restituta; which was published, both separately, and in his Works, vol. ii. Maimbourg's history of this controversy, in French, is full of fables. Muratori, *Annali d'Italia*, tom. iv. p. 221, &c. [For the history of this controversy, see Walch's *Hist. Ketz.* x. 66—828, and xi. 3—400; also Schroeckh, *Kirchen-gesch.* xx. 513—602, and xxiii. 345—432. The origin of this controversy is not generally carried back to the collision of Philip-picus with the Roman pontiff, which related, perhaps, wholly to the doctrines of the Monothelites; nor is there good proof, that the pontiff ventured to excommunicate the emperor. See Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, iii. 180, 181. The following remarks of Schlegel are worth inserting in this place. It is certain, and even the impartial Catholics themselves admit it, that in the first three centuries, and also in the beginning of the fourth, pictures were very rarely to be found among Christians. See Du Pin, *Bibliothèque*, vi. 152, and Anton. Pagi, *Crit. ad Annal. Baronii*, ad ann. 55, p. 43. Indeed there were Christian writers on morals, who disapproved of a Christian's pursuing the trade of a painter or statuary. See Tertullian, *Contra Hermog.* c. i. and *de Idololatria*, c. 3. Even in the time of the seventh general council, A.D. 787, the use of *statues* was not yet introduced into churches; as appears from the seventh Article of that council. Still less did the ancient Christians think of giving *worship* to images. The occasion of introducing

images into churches, was in great measure the ignorance of the people, which rendered pictures a help to them; whence they have been called the *people's Bible*. On this ground Gregory the Great censured Serenus, bishop of Marseilles; who had removed the pictures out of the churches, on account of the misuse the people made of them. Gregory's *Epistles*, lib. ix. ep. 91. *Quia eas (imagines) adorare vetuisses, omnino laudavimus; fregisse vero reprehendimus*. To this cause may be added, the superstition of the people and the monks; who were influenced very much by sensible objects, and who began, as early as the close of the sixth century, to ascribe to the images miracles of various kinds. They now began to kiss the images, to burn incense to them, to kneel before them, to light up wax candles for them, to expect wonders to be wrought by them, to place infants in their arms, at baptisms, as if they were god-fathers and godmothers; to carry them with them in their military expeditions, to secure a victory, and give confidence to the soldiers; and in taking an oath, to lay their hand on them, just as upon the cross, and upon the Gospels. Indeed, nearly the whole of religion, in this century, consisted in the worship of images. In particular, the superstitious worship of images proceeded so far among the Greeks, that the rich, at Constantinople, used to send their bread to the churches, and have it held up before an image previously to eating it. *Tr.*]

This opinion being known, the Romans and other people of Italy who were under the Greeks, violated their allegiance, and either massacred or expelled *Leo's* governors. Exasperated by these things, the emperor began to think of making war upon Italy, and especially upon the pontiff: but circumstances prevented him. Hence, in the year 730, fired with resentment and indignation, he vented his fury against images and their worshippers, much more violently than before. For having assembled a council of bishops, he deposed *Germanus*, bishop of Constantinople, who favoured images, and substituted *Anastasius* in his place; commanded that images should be committed to the flames; and inflicted various punishments upon the advocates of them.¹ The consequence of this severity was, that the Christian church became deplorably rent into two parties, that of *Image-servants*, or *Image-worshippers*, and that of *Image-foes*, or *Image-breakers*,² which furiously contended, with mutual invectives, enormities, and assassinations. The course commenced by *Gregory II.* was warmly prosecuted by *Gregory III.*; and although we cannot determine, at this distance of time, the precise degree of fault in either of these prelates, thus much is unquestionable, that the loss of their Italian possessions which the Greeks underwent in this contest, is to be attributed chiefly to the zeal of these pontiffs in behalf of images.³

¹ [Leo was led on to one degree of innovation after another, by the opposition made to his measures, by the friends of images. At first, he proceeded in the ordinary and legal way. He wished to have the subject discussed and determined, in a general council. But the pope would not agree to it; and urged, that the emperor should remain quiet, and not bring the subject under agitation. Leo's first requisition was, that the images should be *hung higher*, in the churches. But, in this, the patriarch *Germanus* opposed him. And as the opposition of this man was confined to no limits, he was deposed; yet the emperor allowed him, as we are informed by *Theophanes*, to spend his life quietly, in his father's house. Next followed the edict of the emperor, by which he forbade the *worshipping* of images; and required their removal, if the worship of them could not be prevented by the mere prohibition. And it was not, till after the horrible tumult at Constantinople, and the insurrections of the Italian provinces, that he ordered all images upon the church walls to be *effaced*, and the walls to be white-washed; and the moveable images to be carried away, and *burned*; and laid heavy punishments upon the riotous monks and blind zealots, who insulted him to his face, with the title of Antichrist, a second Judas, &c. See *Spanheim, loc. cit.* p. 115, &c. and *Basnage, loc. cit.* ii. 1278. *Schl.*]

² *Iconodulorum* seu *Iconolatrarum*, et *Iconomachorum* seu *Iconoclastarum*.

³ The Greek writers tell us, that both *Gregories* debarred Leo, and his son *Constantine*, from the holy communion; absolved the people of Italy from their oath of allegiance, and forbade their paying taxes, or performing any act of obedience. And the advocates of the Roman pontiffs, *Baronius*, *Sigonius* (*de Regno Italiæ*), and numerous others, who follow after these writers, admit that all these things were facts. Yet some very learned men, particularly among the French, maintain that the *Gregories* did not commit so gross offences; they deny that the pontiffs either excommunicated the emperors, or absolved the people from their allegiance and their duties to them. See *Jo. Launoï, Epistolar.* l. vii. ep. vii. p. 456, in his *Opp.* t. v. pt. ii. *Natal. Alexander, Histor. Eccles. Selecta Capita*, sæcul. viii. diss. i. p. 456. *Peter de Marca, de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, l. iii. c. xi. *Jac. Ben. Bossuet, Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallic. de Potest. Ecclesiastica*, pt. i. l. vi. c. xii. p. 197. *Giannone, Histoire Civile de Naples*, i. 400. These rest chiefly upon the authority of the Latin writers, *Anastasius*, *Paulus Diaconus*, and others; who not only are silent as to this audacity of the pontiffs in assailing and combating the emperors, but also tell us that they gave some proofs of their loyalty to the emperors. The facts cannot be fully ascertained, on account of the obscurity in the history of those times; and the question must be left undecided. Yet this is certain,

§ 12. The son of *Leo*, *Constantine*, who was surnamed *Copronymus*, by the furious crowd of *Image-worshippers*, after he came to the throne A.D. 741, trod in his father's steps: for he laboured with equal vigour to extirpate the worship of images, whatever might be the machinations of the Roman pontiff, and the monks. But he acted with more moderation than his father: for being aware that the Greeks were governed entirely by the authority of councils, in religious matters, he collected a council of eastern bishops, at Constantinople, in the year 754, to examine and decide this controversy. By the Greeks this is called the *seventh general council*. The bishops pronounced sentence, as was customary, according to the views of the emperor, and therefore condemned images.¹ The pertinacity, however, of the superstitious, who were carried away by their zeal for images, was not to be overcome by these decisions. None made greater resistance than the monks; who did not cease to embarrass the government, and work upon the people. *Constantine*, therefore, moved with just indignation, punished many of them in various ways; and even made new laws for setting bounds to the fury of this turbulent class. *Leo IV.*, who succeeded to the throne A.D. 775, on the death of *Constantine*, was of the same mind with his father and grandfather. When, accordingly, he saw it quite impossible to move the abettors of images by mild and gentle measures, he coerced them with penal statutes.

§ 13. *Leo IV.* however, being removed by poison, through the

that those pontiffs, by their zeal for image-worship, occasioned the revolt of their Italian subjects from the Greek emperors. [The arguments adduced by the apologists for the popes, above named, seem to be conclusive as to this point, that the popes did not then feel themselves to have *jurisdiction* over kings and emperors, or to have authority to dethrone them, and to transfer their dominions to other sovereigns. In particular, Gregory II. stated very well the boundary between civil and ecclesiastical power, and reproached *Leo* with over-leaping that boundary. *Tr.*]

¹ [This council was composed of 338 bishops. In his circular letter for calling the council, the emperor directed the bishops to hold provincial councils, throughout the empire, for the discussion of the subject; so that, when met in the general council, they might be prepared to declare the sense of the whole church. The council held its sessions in the imperial palace of Hiera, over against the city on the Asiatic shore; and deliberated from the tenth of February till the seventh of August; when they adjourned to the church of St. Mary ad Blachernas, in Constantinople, and there published their decrees. The patriarch of Constantinople, Anastasius, died a few days before the council met; and the emperor would not appoint a successor to that see, till the de-

liberations of the council were closed; lest it should be thought he placed a creature of his own at the head of it. Of course two other bishops, namely, Theodosius, exarch of Asia, and Pastillus, metropolitan of Pamphylia, presided. Its Acts and deliberations have all perished, or rather been destroyed by the patrons of image-worship; except so much of them, as the second Nicene council saw fit to quote, for the purpose of confuting them, in their sixth Act. (*Harduin's Concilia*, iv. 325—444.) From these quotations it appears, that the council deliberated soberly, and reasoned discreetly, from scripture and the fathers; that they maintained, that all *worship* of images was contrary to scripture, and to the sense of the church in the purer ages; that it was idolatry, and forbidden by the second commandment. They also maintained that the *use* of images in churches and places of worship, was a custom borrowed from the pagans; that it was of dangerous tendency, and ought to be abolished. They accordingly enacted canons, expressive of these views, and requiring a corresponding practice. See Walch's *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 463, &c. Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 646, &c. Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, iii. 357—368. On the side of the Romapists, may be consulted Baronius, *Annales*; and Pagi, *Critica*, ad ann. 754. *Tr.*]

wickedness of his perfidious wife *Irene*, in the year 780, images became triumphant. For that guilty woman, who governed the empire during the minority of her son *Constantine*, with a view to establish her authority, after entering into a league with *Hadrian*, the Roman pontiff, assembled a council at Nice in Bithynia, in the year 786, which is known by the title of the *second* Nicene council. Here, the laws of the emperors, together with the decrees of the council of Constantinople, were abrogated; the worship of images, and of the cross, was established; and penalties were denounced against those who should maintain that nothing but God was to be worshipped and adored. It is impossible to conceive anything more puerile and weak, than the arguments and proofs by which these bishops support their decrees.¹ Nevertheless, the Romans would have the authority of these decrees to be sacred and inviolable; and the Greeks were as furious against those who refused to obey them, as if they had been parricides and traitors. The other enormities of

¹ Martin Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Trident.* pt. iv. loc. ii. cap. v. p. 52, ed. Francf. 1707. Jas. Lenfant, *Préservatif contre la Réunion avec le Siège de Rome*, pt. iii. litter. xvii. p. 446.— [*Irene* was, undoubtedly, an ungodly, hypocritical, ambitious woman; eager after power, and from this passion prone to all, even the most unnatural cruelties; and she was, at the same time, much devoted to image-worship. Her first step was to grant liberty to every one to make use of images in his private worship. She next removed Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople, because he was an Iconoclast; and made her secretary, Tarasius, who was devoted to images and to her, patriarch. And as the imperial guards were inclined to Iconoclasm, and might give her trouble, she caused them to be marched out of the city, under pretence of a foreign invasion, and then disbanded them. At last she called, in the name of her son *Constantine*, who was a minor, the council of Nice. Tarasius directed the whole proceedings. Yet there were two papal envoys present. In the Acts, which we still have entire (in *Harduin's Collection*, iv. 1—820), there is mention of the representatives (*τοποτηρητῶν*) of the two eastern patriarchs, those of Alexandria and Antioch. But according to credible accounts, under this high title, two miserable and illiterate monks were designated; whom their fellow monks had arbitrarily appointed, and whom forged letters legitimated. The bishops assembled were at least 350. Besides these, two officers of the court were present, as commissioners; and a whole army of monks. At first Constantinople was appointed for the place of meeting. But the Iconoclasts, who had the greater part of the army on their side, raised such a tumult, that the empress postponed

the meeting and changed the place to Nice. In the seventh Act of this council, the decree was made, that the cross, and the images of Christ, Mary, the angels, and the saints, were entitled to religious worship (*τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις*); that it was proper to kiss them, to burn incense to them, and to light up candles and lamps before them; yet they were not entitled to *divine worship* (*λατρεία*). The proofs adduced by these fathers, in support of their decree, and their confutations of the contrary doctrine, betray the grossest ignorance, and a total want of critical sagacity, if not also intentional dishonesty. Their Acts are full of fabulous tales of the wonders wrought by images, of appeals to the apocryphal books, of perversions of the declarations of the fathers, and of other faults and puerile arguments. Even Du Pin and Pagi cannot deny the fact. And it is strange how it was possible for doctrines supported by such false reasonings, to become the prevailing doctrines of the whole church. See Walch's *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 477, &c. *Schl.*—Du Pin really exposes the ignorance, or dishonesty, certainly the misrepresentations and absurdities, advanced by this council, at great length. (*New Eccles. Hist.* Engl. Transl. vi. 139.) Undoubtedly, whatever may be thought of the decision to which this assembly committed itself, no well-informed person can deny that more contemptible pleadings have rarely been heard with applause by any body of educated men. We cannot wonder that Mahumedans threw and scoffed, when they were surrounded by Christians wearing very much the appearance of Pagans, and able to justify a spectacle so inconsistent with the letter of Scripture, by no better reasons than those which gave satisfaction at Nice. *S.*]

the flagitious *Irene*, and her end, which befitted her crimes,¹ it belongs not to this history to narrate.

§ 14. In these contests, most of the Latins,—as the Britons [English], the Germans, and the French, took the middle ground between the contending parties; for they decided that images were to be retained, indeed, and to be placed in the churches; but that no religious worship could be offered to them, without dishonouring the Supreme Being.² In particular, *Charles the Great*, at the suggestion of the French bishops, who were displeased with the Nicene decrees, first caused *four books concerning images* to be drawn up by some learned man, which he sent, in the year 790, to the Roman pontiff, *Hadrian*, in order to draw him off from approving the Nicene decrees. In this work, the arguments of the Nicene bishops in defence of image-worship, are acutely and vigorously combated.³ But *Hadrian*, unable to bear such a master, illustrious as he was, controverted his positions in a formal treatise. Wherefore *Charles* assembled, in the year 794, a council of 300 bishops at Frankfort-on-the-Maine; in order to re-examine this controversy. The council approved the sentiments contained in the *Caroline books*; and forbade the worship of images.⁴ Thus it did not seem yet to the Latins of that age an impiety to charge error upon the Roman pontiff, and to treat his decision with neglect.

¹ This most atrocious woman procured the death of her own son Constantine in order that she might reign alone. But in 802 she was banished, by the emperor Nicephorus, to the island of Lesbos; where she died the year following.

² For the abhorrence of image-worship by the Britons, see Henr. Spelman, *ad Concilia Magnæ Britanniae*, i. 73, &c.

³ These books of Charles, *de Imaginibus*, are still extant; republished when become very scarce, with a very learned preface, by Christoph. Aug. Heumann, Hanover, 1731, 8vo. The venerated name of the emperor Charles is attached to the work; but it is easy to discover that it was the production of a learned man, bred in the schools; or of a theologian, and not of the emperor. Some very learned men have conjectured that Charles employed Alcuin, his preceptor, to draw up the book. See Heumann's Preface, p. 51, and the illustrious Bünau, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, i. 490. Nor would I condemn the conjecture. And yet it appears to me somewhat doubtful; for when these books were written, Alcuin was resident in England; as is manifest from his history, he having gone to England in 789, whence he did not return till the year 792. [Alcuin seems to have returned at the close of that, or at the beginning of the following year. In 792, Hoveden says, *Charles sent to Britain that synodal book, directed to him, from Constantinople, in which were found*

many things inconvenient and contrary to the true faith, and against which Alcuin wrote his admirable epistle. There was ample time, therefore, to prepare an enlarged and improved form of this epistle for the council of Frankfort in 794, and dates, instead of invalidating Alcuin's claim to the authorship of the *Caroline books*, really confirm it. S.]

⁴ See, especially, Jo. Mabillon who is likewise ingenuous on this subject, in his *Præf. ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* t. v. p. v. &c. also Geo. Dorscheus, *Collatio ad Concilium Francfordiense*, Argentor., 1649, 4to. [The council of Frankfort was properly a general council; for it was assembled from all the countries subject to Charles; Germany, France, Aquitain, Gaul, Spain, and Italy. Delegates from the pope were present. Charles presided. Two subjects were discussed: the heresy of Felix of Urgel; and the subject of Image-worship. Charles laid his books, *de Imaginibus*, before the council. The council approved of them; and passed resolves in conformity with them; that is, disapproving of the decisions of the Nicene council; and deciding, that while images were to be retained in churches as ornamental and instructive, yet no kind of worship whatever was to be given to them. See Walch's *Hist. Kirchenversamml.* p. 483, and Harduin's *Concilia*, iv. 904, can. 2. Tr.]

§ 15. While these contests about images were raging, another controversy sprang up, between the Greeks and the Latins, respecting the *procession of the Holy Spirit*; which the Latins contended was from both the Father and the Son; but the Greeks, that it was only from the Father. The origin of this controversy is involved in much obscurity: but as it is certain that the subject came up in the council of Gentilly near Paris, A.D. 767, and was there agitated with the ambassadors of the Greek emperor,¹ it is most probable that the controversy originated in Greece, amidst the collisions respecting images. As the Latins defended their opinion on this subject, by appealing to the Constantinopolitan creed, which the Spaniards first, and afterwards the French, had enlarged (though at what time, or on what occasion, is not known), by adding the words (*filioque*) and *from the Son*, to the article concerning the Holy Spirit; the Greeks charged upon the Latins the audacity of corrupting the creed of the church universal, by this interpolation, which they denominated sacrilege. From a contest about a doctrine, therefore, it became a controversy about the insertion of a word.² In the following century this dispute became more violent, and accelerated the separation of the eastern church from the western.³

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES AND CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Ceremonies multiplied — § 2. Zeal of Charles the Great for the Roman rites.

§ 1. THE religion of this century consisted almost wholly in ceremonies and external marks of piety. It is, therefore, not strange, that everywhere more solicitude was manifested for multiplying and regulating these, than for correcting the vices of men, and removing

¹ See Car. le Cointe. *Annales Ecclesiast. Francor.* v. 698.

² Men of eminence for learning have generally supposed, that this controversy commenced respecting the word *filioque*, which some of the Latins had added to the Constantinopolitan creed, and that, from disputing about the *word*, they proceeded to dispute about the *thing*. See, above all others, Jo. Mabillon, (whom very many follow,) *Acta Sanctor.* t. v. Præf. p. iv. But with due deference to those great men, I would say, the fact appears to have been otherwise. The contest commenced respecting the *doctrine*, and afterwards extended to the word *filioque*, or to the interpolation of the creed. From the council of Gentilly it is manifest, that the dispute about the *doctrine* had existed a long time when the

dispute about the *word* commenced. Ant. Pagi, *Critica in Baronium*, iii. 323, thinks, that the controversy grew out of the contest respecting images; that, because the Latins pronounced the Greeks to be heretics for opposing images, the Greeks retaliated the charge of heresy upon the Latins for holding that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son as well as the Father. But this is said without authority and without proof; and is therefore only a probable conjecture.

³ See Pet. Pithæus, *Historia Controversiæ de Processione Spiritus Sancti*; subjoined to his *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Roman.* p. 355, &c. Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 354. Gerh. Jo. Vossius, *de Tribus Symbolis*, diss. iii. p. 65, but especially Jo. Geo. Walch, *Historia Controversiæ de Processione Spiritus Sancti*. Jenæ, 1751, 8vo.

their ignorance and impiety. The mode of celebrating the Lord's supper, which passed for the most important part of God's worship, was everywhere lengthened and deformed, rather than embellished, by various formalities.¹ Manifest traces of private and solitary masses, as they are called, are now distinctly visible; although it is uncertain, whether they were sanctioned by some law, or introduced by the authority of individuals.² As this one practice may suffice to show the ignorance and degeneracy of the times, it is not necessary to mention others.

§ 2. *Charles*, it must be acknowledged, was disposed to impede the progress of superstition to some extent. For, besides forbidding the worship of images as we have already seen, he limited the number of the holydays,³ would not allow bells to be consecrated with water,⁴ and made other commendable regulations. Yet he did not effect much, and chiefly from this cause, among others, that he favoured excessively the Roman pontiffs, whose patronage was enjoyed by the lovers of ceremonies. His father, *Pipin*, had before required the mode of singing practised at Rome to be everywhere introduced.⁵ Treading in his steps, and obeying repeated exhortations from the pontiff *Hadrian*, *Charles* used every exertion to make all churches of the Latins not only copy the Romans in this matter, but also seek the whole form of divine worship from Rome.⁶ There were, however, a few churches, as those of Milan, Chur, and others, which could not be induced in any way to change their old mode of worshipping God.

¹ [Pope Gregory III. among his decisions (in Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 1826, no. 28), gives the following:—'If any one, through negligence, shall destroy the eucharist, *i.e.* the sacrifice, let him do penance one year, or three Quadragesimas. If he lets it fall on the ground carelessly, he must sing fifty psalms. Whoever neglects to take care of the sacrifice, so that worms get into it, or it lose its colour, or taste, must do penance thirty or twenty days; and the sacrifice must be burned in the fire. Whoever turns up the cup at the close of the solemnity of the mass, must do penance forty days. If a drop from the cup should fall on the altar, the minister must suck up the drop, and do penance three days; and the linen cloth, which the drop touched, must be washed three times, over the cup, and the water in which it is washed be cast into the fire.' This same passage occurs in the *Capitula* of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, cap. 51. *Schl.*—Pœnit. c. 39, ed. Thorpe. *Ed.*]

² See *Charles*, *de Imaginibus*, lib. ii. p. 245. Geo. Calixtus, *de Missis Solitariis*, § 12, and others. [The *private*, or *solitary masses*, were so called, to distinguish them from the *public*, or those in which the eucharist was imparted to the congregation; and they were masses in which the priest alone partook of the eucharist. The introduction of these private masses led to a more rare distribution of the eucharist to the assembly; at first, only on the three principal festivals; and at length but once a year. *Schl.*]

³ See note, cent. ix. p. ii. c. iv. § 2.

⁴ [Among the *Capitula* of *Charles*, as given by Harduin (*Concilia*, iv. 846), there is one, No. 18, '*Ut cloccæ non baptizentur.*' *Tr.*]

⁵ [See the *Capitulare Aquisgranense*, No. 80, in Harduin's *Concilia*, iv. 843. *Tr.*]

⁶ See *Charles the Great*, *de Imaginibus*, lib. i. p. 52. Eginhard, *de Vita Caroli Magni*, c. 26, p. 94, ed. Bessel. and others.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF HERESIES.

§ 1. Ancient sects recover strength—§ 2. Clement and Adalbert—§ 3. Felix and Elipandus.

§ 1. THE ancient sects, the *Arians*, *Manichæans*, and *Marcionites*, though so often repressed by penal laws, acquired new strength in the East; and allured many to join them, amidst those calamities with which the Greek empire was perpetually struggling.¹ The *Monothelites*, to whose cause the emperor *Philippicus* and other persons of distinction were well-wishers, began to revive in many places. The condition also of the Nestorians² and Monophysites³ was easy and agreeable under the dominion of the Arabians; nor were they without ability to annoy the Greeks, their foes, and to find new openings for propagating their faith.

§ 2. In the new Germanic church, which *Boniface* built up, there were many people, perverse and void of true religion, if we may believe him and his friends. But we can scarcely do so, because it appears, from many circumstances, that the persons whom he calls patrons of error were Irishmen, Franks, and others, that would not subject themselves to the control of the Roman pontiff, which *Boniface* was labouring to extend. Among others, the most troublesome to him were *Adalbert*, a Frenchman who obtained consecration as a bishop, against the will of Boniface; and also *Clement*, a Scot, or Irishman. The former, who made a disturbance in Franconia, appears to have been not altogether free from error and crime;⁴ for, not to mention other instances of his disregard to truth, there is still extant an Epistle, which he falsely asserted was written by *Jesus Christ*, and brought down from heaven by *Michael* the archangel.⁵ The latter

¹ Among the barbarous nations of Europe also, there were some Arians remaining.

² [From Asseman we obtain some knowledge of the Nestorian patriarchs; the most distinguished of whom were the following. Ananjesu, under whom the Sigan monument was erected A.D. 781. Timotheus, who succeeded Ananjesu, and greatly extended the sect by the conversion of pagan nations near the Caspian Sea, and in Tartary. He left many sermons, an exposition of John's Gospel, ecclesiastical canons, polemic writings, a treatise on astronomy, and two hundred letters. From him we get knowledge of several other writers, and of the divisions caused by them. But as these had no influence on the churches of Europe, we may pass them by. See Baumgarten's *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* iii. 1315, &c. Schl.]

³ [Of the Monophysite patriarchs and writers, we also obtain some knowledge from Asseman. Conspicuous as writers among them were, Elias of Sigara, who commented on the books of Gregory Nazianzen; and Theodosius of Edessa, who wrote poems. Among the Maronites, the patriarch Theophilus obtained renown. He appears to have been the Maronite author who lived about 785, and who not only translated Homer into Syriac, but also composed large historical works. See Baumgarten, as above, p. 1318. Schl.]

⁴ See *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, iv. 82, &c.

⁵ The Epistle is published by Steph. Baluze, in the *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, ii. 1396. [Semler, in his *Hist. Eccles. selecta Capita*, ii. 185, &c. conjectures, that

excelled, perhaps, Boniface himself, in his knowledge of the true religion of Christ; and he is, therefore, not improperly placed by many among the witnesses for the truth in this barbarous age.¹ Both

this Epistle was fabricated by the enemies of Adalbert, and palmed upon him for the sake of injuring him. This, however, is doubtful. The heading of the Epistle purports, that it is an epistle of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, which fell down at Jerusalem, and was found by the archangel Michael near the gate of Ephraim; that a priest read it, transcribed it, and sent it to another priest, who sent it into Arabia. After passing through many hands, it came at length to Rome, &c. Accompanying this letter, as transmitted by Boniface to the pope, was a biography of Adalbert; which stated, that his mother had a marvellous dream before his birth, which was interpreted to signify that her child would be a distinguished man: also a prayer, said to have been composed by him, in which he invoked four or five angels by name, that are not mentioned in the Bible. The letter of Boniface, containing the accusation against both Adalbert and Clement, states, that Boniface had now laboured thirty years among the Franks, in the midst of great trials and opposition from wicked men; that his chief reliance had been on the protection of the Roman pontiffs, whose pleasure he had always followed: that his greatest trouble had been with '*two most base public heretics and blasphemers of God and the catholic faith*,' Adalbert, a Frenchman, and Clement, a Scotchman, *who held different errors, but were equal in amount of criminality*. And he prays the pontiff to defend him against these men, and to restrain them by imprisonment and excommunication from annoying the churches. 'For,' said he, 'on account of these men, I incur persecution, and the enmity and curses of many people; and the church of Christ suffers obstructions to the progress of the faith and holy doctrine.' Of Adalbert he says: 'The people say, respecting him, that I have deprived them of a most holy apostle, patron, and intercessor, a worker of miracles, and a shower of signs. But your piety will judge from his works, after hearing his life, whether he is not one clad in sheep's clothing, but within a ravening wolf. For he was a hypocrite in early life, asserting that an angel, in human form, brought to him from distant countries relics of marvellous sanctity, but of whom it was uncertain; and that, by means of these relics, he could obtain from God whatever he asked. And then, with this pretence, as Paul predicted, he entered into many houses, and led captive silly women, laden with sins and carried away by divers lusts; and he seduced a multitude

of the rustics, who said that he was a man of apostolic sanctity, and wrought signs and wonders. He next hired some ignorant bishops to ordain him, contrary to the canons, without assigning him a specific charge. He now became so insolent, as to assume equality with the apostles of Christ, and disdained to dedicate a church to any apostle or martyr, and reproached the people for being so eager to visit the thresholds of the holy apostles. Afterwards he ridiculously consecrated oratories to his own name; or rather defiled them. He also erected small crosses, and houses for prayer, in the fields, and at fountains, and wherever he saw fit, and directed public prayers to be there offered; so that great multitudes, despising the bishops, and forsaking the ancient churches, held their religious meetings in such places, and would say, The merits of St Adalbert will aid us. He also gave his nails and locks of his hair to be kept in remembrance of him, and to be placed with the relics of St. Peter, the prince of apostles. And, finally, what appears the summit of his wickedness and blasphemy against God, when people came and prostrated themselves before him, to confess their sins, he said: I know all your sins, for all secrets are known to me; return securely, and in peace, to your habitations. And all that the holy Gospel testifies as done by hypocrites, he has imitated in his dress, his walk, and his deportment.'—The Epistle then describes the wickedness of Clement, thus: 'The other heretic, whose name is Clement, opposes the catholic church, and renounces and confutes the canons of the church of Christ. He refuses to abide by the treatises and discourses of the holy fathers, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory. Despising the decrees of councils, he affirms that, in his opinion, a man can be a Christian bishop, and bear the title, after being the father of two sons, begotten in adultery [*i.e.* in clerical wedlock]. Introducing Judaism again, he deems it right for a Christian, if he pleases, to marry the widow of his deceased brother. Also, contrary to the faith of the holy fathers, he maintains that Christ, the Son of God, descended into hell, and liberated all that were there detained in prison, believers and unbelievers, worshippers of God and worshippers of idols. And many other horrible things he affirms respecting divine predestination, and contravening the catholic faith.' See Harduin's *Concilia*, iii. 1936—1940. Tr.]

¹ The errors of Clement are enumerated by Boniface, *Epist.* cxxxv. p. 189. Among

were condemned by the Roman pontiff *Zacharias*, at the instigation of *Boniface*, in a council at Rome, A.D. 748. And both, it appears, died in prison.

§ 3. Much greater commotions were produced in Spain, France, and Germany, towards the close of the century, by *Felix*, bishop of Urgel, in Spain, a man distinguished for his piety. Being consulted by *Elipandus*, archbishop of *Toledo*, respecting his opinion upon the sonship of Christ, the Son of God, he answered, in the year 783, that *Christ*, as God, was by nature, and truly, the Son of God; but that as a man, he was the Son of God only *in name*, and *by adoption*. This doctrine, which he had imbibed from his preceptor, Elipandus disseminated in the provinces of Spain, while Felix himself, its author, spread it in Septimania.¹ But in the view of the pontiff *Hadrian*, and of most of the Latin bishops, this opinion seemed to revive the error attributed to *Nestorius*, and to divide Christ into *two persons*. Hence *Felix* was judged guilty of heresy, and required to change his opinion; first, in the council of Narbonne, A.D. 788, then at Ratisbon, in Germany, A.D. 792; also at Frankfort-on-the-Main, A.D. 794; and afterwards at Rome, A.D. 799; and lastly in the council of Aix-la-Chapelle. He did change his opinion ostensibly, but not in reality; for he died in it, at Lyons, whither he was banished by *Charles the Great*.² No rule of faith could be imposed upon *Elipandus* by the Christians, because he lived under the Saracens in Spain. Many believe, and not without reason, that the disciples of *Felix*, who were called *Adoptianists*, differed from other Christians, not in reality, but only in words, or in the mode of stating their views.³ But as Felix was not uniform in his language, those who accuse him of the Nestorian error have some grounds to go upon.

these errors, there is certainly no one that is capital. See Jac. Ussher, *Sylloge Epistolæ Hibernicar.* p. 12, and *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. Crit.* tom. i. p. 133, &c. [For the history of the controversy with both Adalbert and Clement, see Walch's *Hist. Ketz.* x. 3—66. *Tr.*—Mosheim's inference as to Clement's superiority in knowledge to Boniface is entirely groundless. *Ed.*]

¹ [Or Languedoc. *Tr.*]

² The authors who have treated of the sect of Felix, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his *Bibliotheca Lat. Mediæ ævi*, ii. 482. To these add Peter de Marca, in the *Marca Hispanica*, iii. c. 12, p. 368, &c. Jo. de Ferreras, *Histoire générale d'Espagne* ii. 518. 523. 535. 536. 560. Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* t. v. Præf. p. ii. &c. Of Felix, in particular, account is given by Domin. Colonia, *Histoire Littér. de la Ville de Lyon*, ii. 79, and by the Benedictine monks, in *Histoire Littér. de la France*, iv. 434, &c. [Walch, *Hist. Ketz.* ix. 667—940, and *Historia Adoptianorum*, Gotting. 1755, 8vo. See also Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xx. 459—498. *Tr.*]

³ Jo. Geo. Dorscheus, *Collat. ad Concilium Francof.* p. 101. Sam. Werenfels, *de Logomachiis Eruditior.* in his *Opp.* p. 459. Jac. Basnage, *Præf. ad Etherium*, in Henr. Canisii *Lectionibus Antiquis*, t. ii. pt. i. p. 284. Geo. Calixtus, in his *Tract* on this subject, and others.—[Walch, in his *Historia Adoptianor.* considers Felix as not a Nestorian; and yet he regards the controversy as not merely about words. The substance of Felix's views he thus states: Christ as a man, and without regard to the personal union of the two natures, was born a *servant of God*, though without sin. From the condition of a *servant*, he passed into that of a *free person*, when God, at his baptism, pronounced him his *dear Son*. This transaction was his *adoption*, and likewise his *regeneration*. The title of *God* belongs to him, indeed, as a man; but not properly, for he is God only *nuncupatively*. Thus did Felix utter something unsuitable and new; but his innovation was not a ground for so great an alarm throughout the whole church, as if he had assailed the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. *Tr.*]

NINTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1, 2. The Swedes, Danes, and Cimbrians converted — § 3. The Bulgarians, Bohemians, and Moravians — § 4. The Slavonian tribes, the Russians — § 5. Estimate of these conversions.

§ 1. So long as *Charles* the Great lived, which was till the year 814, he omitted no means which seemed requisite, to propagate and establish Christianity among the Huns, the Saxons, the Frieslanders, and others.¹ But it is to be regretted that he did not omit to employ violence and war. His son *Lewis* the Meek, though greatly below him in other respects, had the same zeal for propagating Christianity. Under this prince, a convenient opportunity was presented for planting Christianity among the northern nations, especially the Danes and Swedes.² *Harald Klack*, a petty sovereign of Jutland, being expelled his kingdom by *Reyner Lodbrock*, in the year 826, applied

¹ [Among these must be included the Carinthians. They had indeed partially received Christianity, in the preceding century, from Virgilius bishop of Salzburg. For Boruth, the duke of Carinthia, when he committed his son Corastus to the Bavarians, as a hostage, requested, that he might be baptized and educated as a Christian; and he also requested the same, in regard to his nephew Chetimar. Now, as both these afterwards became dukes of Carinthia, it may be readily conceived, that the Christian religion had made considerable progress there, before this century. In 803, Charles came to Salzburg, and confirmed to Arno his ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Slavonia, or Carinthia in lower Pannonia. The presbyters, whom bishop Arno sent into Carinthia,

to build up the churches there, adopted a singular artifice, to render Christianity respectable, and paganism contemptible, in the eyes of the people. They allowed Christian slaves to sit at table with them, while their pagan masters had to eat their bread and meat without the doors; and had to drink out of black cups, whereas the servants drank from gilded cups. For the presbyters told the masters, 'You unbaptized persons are not worthy to eat with those that are baptized.' This enkindled such a desire to become Christians, that great numbers of them were baptized. See the Life of St. Ruprecht, in Canisii *Lectonibus Antiq.* t. vi. of the old ed. 4to. *Schl.*]

² [Ebbo, archbishop of Rheims, who had travelled as an imperial envoy in the north-

to the emperor for assistance. *Lewis* promised it, on condition that he would embrace Christianity himself, and admit teachers of that religion into his country. *Harald* acceding to the terms, not only was baptized at Mentz, A.D. 826, together with his brother, but also took home with him two preachers of Christianity, *Ansgarius*, a monk and schoolmaster of Corbey in Saxony, and *Autbert*, a monk of old Corbie;¹ which monks preached among the inhabitants of Jutland and Cimbria, for two years, with great success.

§ 2. On the death of his fellow-labourer *Autbert*, in the year 828, the indefatigable *Ansgarius* went over to Sweden; and there was equally happy in pleading the cause of Christ.² Returning into Germany, *Lewis* the Meek constituted him, in the year 831, archbishop of the new church of Hamburg,³ and of all the North; and in the year 844, the episcopal see of Bremen was annexed to that of Hamburg. The profits of this high station were small,⁴ while its perils were very great, and its labours immense. For *Ansgarius*, while he lived, took frequent journeys among the Danes,⁵ the Cimbrians, the Swedes,⁶ and other nations; and laboured, though at the

ern countries, made an attempt, as early as 822, to spread Christianity there; and, together with Halitgar of Cambrai, he obtained from pope Paschal a full power for this purpose. See *Acta Sanctor.* Antw. ad 3. Februar. and Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor.* sæc. iv. pt. ii. p. 79, 90. *Schl.*

¹ [In Picardy. *S.*]

² [The Christians who were carried into captivity by the Norsemen, undoubtedly contributed much to give this people a favourable disposition towards Christianity; and especially by recounting to them the wealth and the power of the Christian countries, which were ascribed to their religion. This will account for what historians affirm, that Swedish ambassadors came to king *Lewis*, and stated among other things, that many of their people had an inclination towards Christianity, and that their king would cheerfully permit Christian priests to reside among them. *Anscharius* and *Witmar* were sent thither, with rich presents. Their voyage was unfortunate; for they fell into the hands of pirates, who plundered them. Yet they finally reached the port of Biork, which belonged to the king, *Bern* or *Biorn*. There they collected a congregation and built a church, in the course of six months; the king having given liberty to his subjects to embrace the new religion. On the return of these missionaries, the congregation in Sweden was without a teacher, till *Ebbo* sent them his nephew *Gausbert*, who, at his ordination to the episcopate, took the name of *Simon*; but he was, soon after, driven out of Sweden. *Schl.*]

³ [The diocese of Hamburg was then very small, embracing but four parish churches. *Lewis* sent *Anschar* to the pope; who conferred on him the archiepiscopal pall, and

constituted him his legate for Sweden, Denmark, the Faroe islands, Iceland, &c. as also among the Slavians, and the northern and eastern tribes. See the *Acta Sanctor.* Feb. t. i. and Mabillon, l. c. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Lewis the Meek assigned him the revenues of a monastery in Brabant, towards the expenses of his mission. But the income was very small; and ceased altogether on the death of *Lewis*. *Anschar* must therefore have been in want of resources. He at last received a small estate, from a pious widow, in Ramelslob near Bremen. *Schl.*]

⁵ [The violent persecution, to which the Danish Christians were exposed, was one occasion for his repeatedly visiting that country. He was himself driven from Hamburg (by an invasion of the Norsemen), and the city being wholly laid waste, he had to reside some time at Bremen. He was at length permitted to enter Denmark, by king *Eric*; and being allowed to preach there, he erected a church at Hadeby or Schleswig, in 850. But this king being slain in 856, during the minority of his son *Eric Baern*, there was fresh persecution, and the church of Schleswig was shut up. When this king began to reign in person, he was more favourable to the Christians, and permitted *Anschar* to return, and to erect a new church at Ripen, A.D. 860. *Tr.*]

⁶ [To Sweden he sent the priest *Ardgarius*; and likewise went there himself, a second time, in the character of envoy from king *Lewis* to king *Olaus*; who was induced by presents, to support *Anschar* in two imperial Swedish diets, at which the establishment of Christianity was decided by casting lots. He now re-established Christian worship at Biork, and left *Herimbert* there as a Christian teacher. *Schl.*]

peril of his life, to collect new Christian congregations, and to strengthen those previously formed, till death overtook him, A.D. 865.¹

§ 3. About the middle of this century, two Greek monks, *Methodius* and *Cyril*, being sent as missionaries from Constantinople, by the empress *Theodora*, taught first the Moesians, Bulgarians, and Gazari, and afterwards the Bohemians and Moravians, to renounce their false gods, and receive Christ.² Some knowledge of Christianity

¹ The writers who treat of the life and labours of this holy and illustrious parent of the Cimbrian, Danish, and Swedish churches, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Latin. Mediæ Evæ*, i. 292, &c. and *Lux Evangelii toto Orbi Terrar. exoriens*, p. 425, &c. To these, add the Benedictine monks' *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 277. *Acta Sanctor. mens. Februar. i. 391*, &c. Eric Pontoppidan, *Annales Eccles. Danicæ Diplomaticæ*, i. 18, &c. Möllerus, *Cimbria Litterata*, iii. 8, &c. From these writers, a knowledge may be gained of the others also; namely, Ebbo, Withmar, Rembert, &c. who were either the companions and assistants of Ansharius, or his successors in the field of labour. [The life of Anshar, well written by Rembert, his disciple and successor in the see of Hamburg, is in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. vi. 78*, &c. Among the recent writers, see Schmidt, *Kirchengesch. iv. 108—119*. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. xxi. 314*, &c. and archbishop Münter's *Kirchengesch. von Dänem. und Norweg. vol. i. Lips. 1823. Tr.*]

² Jo. Geo. Stredowsky, *Sacra Moravia Historia*, i. li. c. ii. p. 94, &c. Compare Jo. Peter Kohl, *Introduct. in Historiam et Rem Litterar. Slavorum*, p. 124, &c. and others. [A much ampler account of the missions and conversions mentioned in this and following sections, is given by Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. xxi. 396*, &c. and by J. E. C. Schmidt, *Kirchengesch. iv. 120*, &c. also by Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Kalendaria Ecclesiæ Universæ*, iii. 3, &c. Rome, 1755, 4to.—The following summary, by Schlegel, contains the most material results of modern investigation. *Tr.*] The seeds of Christianity had been previously scattered among the Bulgarians, by some Christian captives. In 814, Crummus, the Bulgarian king, captured Adrianople, and carried the bishop, Manuel, with other of the citizens, into captivity; and his successor afterwards put this bishop with other Christian captives to death; because they made proselytes among the Bulgarians. After this, it appears, that both the monk Theodorus Cupharas, who was a captive in that country, and a sister of the Bulgarian king Bogoris, who had been taken prisoner and carried to Constantinople, where she was educated and taught the Christian religion,

and then exchanged for the monk Theodorus, contributed much to recommend Christianity to that people. The way being thus prepared, Bogoris admitted several artists from Constantinople, among whom was the famous painter Methodius, who, instead of drawing worldly scenes for the king, formed religious pictures, and among them, one of the judgment day; and instructed him in the principles of Christianity. Not long after, the king, in a time of famine, openly professed Christianity, and invited teachers from abroad. But his subjects made insurrection against him for it; and he caused fifty-two of the ringleaders to be put to death, and at length brought the rest to embrace the new religion. In 848 (for thus Asseman has ascertained the true year, in his *Kalendar. Eccles. Universæ*, iii. 13, &c. whereas Kohl and Stredowsky state 843), Constantine, the brother of this Methodius, had been sent among the Chazari [or Gazari], whose king had likewise desired to have Christian teachers. Constantine laid the foundation of the Christian church among this people, translated the Scriptures into the Slavonic language, and taught that barbarous nation the use of letters. After this, he came to the aid of his brother, among the Bulgarians; and in 861, baptized king Bogoris, who assumed at the font the name of the Greek emperor Michael.—The two brothers, Constantine and Methodius, were natives of Thessalonica. The former, who was the eldest, afterwards took the name of Cyril; and on account of his learning, was surnamed the Philosopher. The younger was distinguished as a painter. It is probable, that both of them, in early life, fled from Constantinople, to avoid the persecution which befel the worshippers of images, and especially the painters of them; and that they took refuge among the Slavonic tribes, and there learned their language, which was afterwards of use to them in the propagation of Christianity.—From the Bulgarians, Constantine, it is stated, travelled among the adjacent Dalmatians and Croats, and baptized their king Budimir. See Baumgarten's *Auszug der Kirchengesch. iii. 1379*, and S. Semler's *Selecta Hist. Eccles. Capita*, ii. 263, 269.—As to the Bohemians, the *Chronicles of Fulda*, ad ann. 845, state that under Lewis, king of the Germans, fourteen

had indeed been previously imparted to these nations, through the influence of *Charles* the Great and of certain bishops;¹ but that knowledge produced little effect, and gradually became extinct. As the missionaries above named were Greeks, they inculcated on those new disciples the opinions of the Greeks, their forms of worship and their rites;² from which the Roman pontiffs, afterwards, by their legates, were able but partially to reclaim them. And from this source great commotions occasionally arose.

§ 4. Under the Greek emperor, *Basil* the Macedonian, who ascended the throne A.D. 867, the Slavonic nations, the Arentani, and others, who inhabited Dalmatia, sent ambassadors to Constantinople, and voluntarily placed themselves in subjection to the Greek empire; and, at the same time, they professed a readiness to receive Christianity. Greek priests were therefore sent among them, who instructed and baptized them.³ The same emperor, after concluding a peace with the warlike nation of the Russians, persuaded them by presents and other means, to promise him, by their ambassadors, that they would embrace Christianity. The nation stood to their promise, and admitted not only Christian teachers among them, but also an archbishop, commissioned by *Ignatius*, the Greek patriarch.⁴ This was

Bohemian lords, with their subjects, embraced the Christian religion. And it is well known, that towards the close of the century, the Bohemian prince Borivoi or Borsivoi was baptized. Suatopluc or Zwentibold, king of the Moravians, appears to have greatly aided this conversion. For having been baptized himself, he treated this pagan prince roughly, while residing at his court, and would not allow him to sit at his table; because, as he told him, it was not suitable for a pagan to eat with Christians. Perhaps also the assurance given him by Methodius, may have contributed to his conversion; for he told him, that if he embraced Christianity, he would become a greater man than any of his ancestors. In short, he consented to be baptized; and returning home, he persuaded his wife Ludmilla, with many others, to receive baptism also; and afterwards, with the aid of his wife, greatly promoted the spread of Christianity; and, among other means, by erecting a famous school at Budec. See S. Semler, l. c. p. 261, 265.—The Moravians were converted, under their king Radislav. He sent for the two monks, Constantine and Methodius; and they erected a school at Vetvar, baptized the king, and his most distinguished subjects, translated many books into the Slavonic language, and set up public worship in this tongue. They erected churches in several places, particularly at Olmutz and Brünn; but they introduced also image-worship, to which they were addicted. See Baumgarten's *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* iii. 1429, &c. *Schl.*

¹ Stredowsky, loc. cit. lib. i. cap. ix. p. 55, &c. [When Charles, in his wars with

the Huns and Avars, was victorious, he compelled the Moravian king Samoslay, to embrace Christianity; and Arno of Salzburg, in particular, undertook to convert these tribes; and in this business, the monk Godwin was employed; and under Lewis the Pious, Orolph the archbishop of Lorch also. See Pagi, *Critic.* ad ann. 824. In 822, Mogemir, the successor of Samoslay, became a confederate of the emperor Lewis, and gave free toleration to the Christian worship, on which he himself attended. This good beginning in the conversion of the Slavonic nations, in Moravia, was however much interrupted, by the contests that arose between the bishops of Salzburg and those of Passau; and besides, the ignorance of the Christian missionaries of the Slavonic language, and their introducing the Latin formulas of worship, were serious obstacles to success. And at last, the wars between the Germans and the Moravians, the latter having wholly renounced the dominion of the former, put a full stop to the progress of the gospel among that people. See Baumgarten's *Auszug*, iii. 1430, &c. *Schl.*

² Jac. Lenfant, *Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites*, l. i. c. i. p. 2, &c. and compare the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, xxi. 2—4.

³ This we learn from Constantine Porphyrogenitus de *Administrando Imperio*, cap. xxix.; in Anselm Banduri's *Imperium Orientale*, t. i. 72, 73. Constantine also relates the same, in his life of his grandfather, Basil the Macedonian, § liv. *Corpus Hist. Byzantin.* xvi. 133, 134.

⁴ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, de *Vita Basilii Macedonis*, § xevi., in the *Corpus*

the commencement of Christianity among the Russian people. They were inhabitants of the *Ukraine*; and a little before had fitted out a fleet at Kiow, in which they appeared before Constantinople, to the great terror of the Greeks.¹

§ 5. The Christian missionaries to barbarous nations, in this age, were men of more piety and virtue than most of those who took that office upon themselves in the preceding century. Nothing now was done by punishments and fear; the Roman pontiff's interest was either disregarded altogether, or but moderately promoted; the preachers themselves were free from arrogance, insolence, and the suspicion of licentiousness. Yet the religion taught by them was very wide of that simple rule of truth and holiness which the apostles of Christ preached, and was debased by many human inventions and superstitions. Among the nations which they converted, also, the preachers allowed too many relics of the old superstitions to remain; and in truth, they rather inculcated an external form of piety, than piety itself. The good and pious men, it must, however, be admitted, really could not help giving up many things to the rudeness of barbarian populations.

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Success of the Saracens—§ 2, 3. The Norman Pirates.

§ 1. THE Saracens were in possession of all Asia, to the borders of India, a few regions only excepted. They also held the best parts of Africa; and in the West, Spain, and Sardinia. In the year 827, relying on the treason of certain persons, they subjugated the very

Hist. Byzant. xvi. 157; and *Narratio de Ruthenorum Conversione*; published Gr. and Lat. by Banduri, *Imperium Orientale*, in his notes to Porphyrogenitus, *de Administrando Imperio*, ii. 62.

¹ Mich. le Quien, in his *Oriens Christianus*, i. 1257, gives account of this conversion of the Russians to Christianity, in the reign of Basil the Macedonian; but he has made a number of mistakes, as others had done before him. He first tells us, that the Russians here intended, were those that bordered on the Bulgarians; but, a little after, he tells us, they were the Gazari. For this opinion, he has but one reason, namely, that among the teachers sent to instruct the Russians, was that Cyril, who was active in the conversion of the Gazari. The learned

author was ignorant of both the Russians and the Gazari. He has made also other mistakes. The subject is developed much better, and more accurately, by Theoph. Sigefr. Bayer, *Diss. de Russorum Prima Expeditione Constantinopolitana*; published in the sixth volume of the *Commentar. Acad. Scientiar. Petropolitanae*, A.D. 1738, 4to. [See also Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxi. 507, &c. and J. E. C. Schmidt's *Kirchengesch.* iv. 166, &c. *Tr.*—Mouravieff's *History of the Russian Church*, p. 9. The Russian empire began in 862, under Ruric, a pagan of Scandinavian descent. Two of his princes, Oskold and Dir, were baptized at Constantinople in 866. But the conversion of Russia belongs to the next century. *Ed.*]

fertile island of Sicily.¹ When the century was near its close, the Asiatic Saracens, now masters of many cities in Calabria, spread terror even to the walls of the city of Rome. They also partly ravaged, partly occupied Crete, Corsica, and other islands. How great was the injury to the Christian cause, everywhere, from these successes of a nation accustomed to wars and rapine, and hostile to the Christians, everyone can easily comprehend. In the East especially, numberless families of Christians embraced the religion of their conquerors, to render their lives more comfortable. Those possessed of more resolution and piety, gradually sank into a wretched state, being not only stripped of the chief of their property, but, what was still more lamentable, they fell by degrees into a kind of religious stupor, and an amazing ignorance; so that they retained almost nothing Christian, except the name, and a few religious rites. The Saracens in Europe, and particularly those of Spain, became divested in a great measure of their ferocity; and suffered their Christian subjects to live quietly, according to their own laws and institutions. Yet instances of cruelty were not wanting among them.²

§ 2. Another and even a more dreadful plague, came upon the European Christians from the regions of the North. The Normans, that is the people inhabiting the shores of the Baltic in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, who were accustomed to rapine and slaughter, and whose petty kings and chieftains practised piracy, had infested the coasts along the German and Gallic oceans, while *Charles* the Great yet reigned: that emperor, accordingly, had already stationed camps and officers to oppose them. But in this century, having grown much more bold, they made frequent incursions upon Germany, Britain, Friesland, but especially France, plundering and

¹ [Euphemius, a general in Sicily, ravished a nun. Her brothers complained to the viceroy, who laid the case before the emperor; and he ordered the nose of Euphemius to be cut off. Euphemius repelled the force sent to arrest him, and fled to Africa. There he offered the Saracen governor to put him in possession of all Sicily, if he would entrust him with an army, and allow him to assume the title of a Roman *Imperator*. The governor consented, and Euphemius fulfilled his promise; but he had scarcely accomplished his design when he lost his life at Syracuse by assassination. See the account given by John Curopalata, as cited by Baronius, *Annal.* t. ix. ad ann. 827, § xxiv. &c. *Tr.*]

² See, for example, the martyrdom of Eulogius of Corduba, in the *Acta Sanctorum*. ad d. xi. Martii, t. ii. p. 88, and those of Roderic and Salomon, Spanish martyrs of this century, in the same vol. ad d. xiii. Martii, p. 328. [The Saracens of Spain were tolerant to the Christians so long as they demeaned themselves as quiet and peaceable citizens; and they allowed them the free exercise of their religion. But they would not allow them to revile Mahumed and his

religion; and this was the source of all the difficulties. Abdalrahman consulted Reccafred, a Christian bishop, on the subject. The bishop stated, that when Christians traduced the Mahumedan religion, without urgent cause, and laboured to introduce their own in place of it, if they thereby lost their lives, they could not be accounted martyrs. A number of Christians agreed with Reccafred, but the majority dissented; and Eulogius wrote against Reccafred, and compiled histories of the Spanish martyrs. He, and those in his sentiments, exerted all their efforts to run down Mahumedism, and to make converts to Christianity. They also courted martyrdom, and in several instances invited the judges to put them to death. The particular offence of Eulogius, for which he was put to death, was detaining and secreting a Spanish girl, whom he had converted from the Mussulman to the Christian faith, and not giving her up to her parents and friends. See his three books, *de Martyribus Cordubensibus*; his *Apologeticus pro Martyribus adv. Calumniatores*; and his *Echortatio ad Martyrium*; in the *Biblioth. Patr.* xv. 666, &c. and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxi. 294, &c. *Tr.*]

devastating, with fire and sword, wherever they went. The terrific inroads of these savage hordes extended not only to Spain,¹ but even to the centre of Italy: for it appears from the writers of those times, that they destroyed the city of Luna, in the year 857, and Pisa and other cities of Italy, in the year 860.² The early histories of the Franks detail and deplore, at great length, their horrid enormities.

§ 3. At first these ferocious people sought only plunder and slaves in the countries which they invaded;³ but by degrees becoming captivated with the beauty and fertility of their conquests, they made a home in them; nor could the European kings and princes prevent it. In this very century, *Charles* the Bald was obliged, A.D. 850, to cede a considerable part of his kingdom to these bold invaders.⁴ And a few years after, in the reign of *Charles* the Fat, king of the Franks, *Godfred*, one of their most valiant chieftains, went on fighting until he had subdued all Friesland.⁵ When, however, permanently settled among Christians, they gradually became civilised; and, marrying women who professed Christianity, they themselves exchanged for it the superstitions of their ancestors. This was done by that *Godfred*, who conquered Friesland, in this century, after he had received for his wife, from *Charles* the Fat, *Gisela*, daughter of the younger king *Lothaire*.

¹ Jo. de Ferreras, *Histoire générale d'Espagne*, ii. 583. Piracy was esteemed among these northern nations a very honourable and laudable profession; and to it the nobility and the sons and the kindred of kings were trained. Nor will this surprise us if we consider the religion of those nations, and the barbarism of the times. See Jo. Lud. Holberg, *Historia Danorum et Norvegorum navalis*; in the *Scripta Societatis Scientiarum Hafniensis*, iii. 349, where he relates many interesting accounts respecting these maritime robberies from the annals of the Danes and Norwegians.

² See the *Scriptores Rerum Italicar.* by Muratori, in various passages.

³ [This object of the Normans (making plunder) occasioned the destruction of a vast number of churches and monasteries in England, France, Germany, and Italy. For in these places were deposited large treasures, partly belonging to the establishments, and partly placed there for safe keeping. They were, therefore, generally fortified; and the bishops and abbots, who were also bound to do military service for their lands, were obliged to defend them against the incursions of foreign enemies. *Schl.*]

⁴ *Annales*, by an unknown author, in *Pithœi Scriptores Francici*, p. 46.

⁵ Reginonis Prumiensis *Annales*, l. ii. p. 60, in *Pistorii Scriptor. German.*

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of learning among the Greeks—§ 2. State of philosophy—§ 3. Learning among the Arabians—§ 4. State of learning under Charles the Great and his sons—§ 5. Impediments to its progress—§ 6. List of learned men.—§ 7. John Scotus.

§ 1. THE Greeks experienced many things in this age, which could not but damp their ardour for learning and philosophy. Still, however, the munificence of the emperors, some of whom themselves were devoted to study, and the precautions of the patriarchs, among whom *Photius* shone conspicuous for erudition, prevented an absolute dearth of learned men, particularly at Constantinople. Hence there were among the Greeks, some who excelled both in prose and in poetic composition; who showed their skill in argumentation, by their writings against the Latins and others; and who composed histories of their own times not altogether destitute of merit. In particular, when their disputes with the Latins became warm, many who would otherwise have suffered their talents to be eaten up of rust, were roused to set about cultivating elegance and copiousness of diction.

§ 2. That the study of philosophy, among the Greeks of this century, continued for a long time neglected, is testified expressly by *John Zonaras*. But under the emperor *Theophilus* and his son *Michael III.*, the study of it revived, through the influence especially of *Bardas*, the Cæsar,¹ who, though himself not learned, was the friend of *Photius*, who was a very learned man and a great Mæcenas, and by whose counsels, no doubt, *Bardas* was guided in this matter. At the head of all the learned men, to whose protection he intrusted the interests of learning, *Bardas* placed *Leo the Wise*, a man of great learning, and afterwards bishop of Thessalonica.² *Photius* himself expounded what are called the *Categories* of Aristotle: and *Michael Psellus* wrote brief explanations of the principal books of that philosopher. Others I pass over.

¹ *Annales*, t. ii. l. xvi. p. 126, in the *Corpus Byzant.* t. x.

² [Among the Greek emperors who advanced science, Basil the Macedonian should not be forgotten. He was himself not without learning; as is evident from his speeches,

and counsels to his son Leo, still extant. This son, who was surnamed the Wise, and the Philosopher, composed largely; the most important of his works are the sixty books of his *Basilicon*, or Imperial Laws, his *Tactica*, and his speeches. *Schl.*]

§ 3. The Arabians, who hitherto had strained every nerve, not to cultivate the sciences, but to enlarge their borders, being now excited by the fondness for literary pursuits of *Al Mamun*, or *Abu Gaafar Abdallah*, and by his patronage of learned men, made much greater progress. For this excellent caliph of Babylon and Egypt, who began to reign about the time that *Charles* the Great died, and ended his days A.D. 833, founded celebrated schools at Bagdad, Cufa, Basora, and other places; drew learned men around him, by conferring on them great rewards; established ample libraries; procured, at great expense, the translation of the best works of the Greeks into Arabic; and neglected no means which could do honour to a prince greatly attached to literature and science, and himself a distinguished proficient.¹ Through his influence, the Arabians began to find pleasure in Grecian learning; and to propagate it by degrees, not only in Syria and Africa, but also in Spain, and even in Italy. Hence they celebrate a long list of renowned philosophers, physicians, astronomers, and mathematicians of their nation, extending through several centuries.² Yet we must not take all that the modern Saracenic historians tell us, of the merits and endowments of these men, in the most literal sense.³ From the Arabians, the Christians afterwards profited in the sciences. For all the knowledge of mathematics, astronomy, medicine, and philosophy, propagated in Europe from the tenth century onward, was derived principally from the schools and the books of the Arabians in Italy and Spain. And hence the Saracens may, in some measure, be considered as the restorers of learning in Europe.

§ 4. In the part of Europe subject to the Franks, *Charles* the Great, while he lived, cherished and honoured learning of all kinds with great earnestness. If his successors had followed him with equal strides, or been capable of doing so, ignorance and barbarism would soon have been expelled. He was not, indeed, altogether without imitators. *Lewis* the Meek, copying after his father, devised and executed several projects, suited to promote and advance the useful arts and sciences.⁴ His son, *Charles* the Bald, went beyond his father

¹ Abulpharajus, *Historia Dynastiar.* p. 246. Geo. Elmacin, *Historia Saracen.* l. ii. p. 139. Barthol. Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, article *Mamun*, p. 545.

² See Leo Africanus, *Tract. de Medicis et Philosophis Arabibus*; republished by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his *Biblioth. Græca*, xii. 259, &c.

³ [In the abstruse sciences they are said to have been mere copyists, or rather plagiarists, from the Greeks and Latins; particularly from Aristotle, Euclid, Galen, &c. Even Avicenna, whose Canon, or system of physic, was classic in the European medical schools so late as the sixteenth century, we are told, advanced nothing very important but what is to be found in Galen and others. Their astronomy was more properly *astrology*, or divination from the starry heavens.

See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxi. 279—292. *Tr.*]

⁴ See the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 583, &c. [The Paatine school continued to flourish under Lewis the Meek. Also many monasteries were re-established or instituted anew in which the sciences were studied. From his *Capitulaire* ii. (in Harduin's *Concilia*, iv. 1251, No. 5), may be seen how desirous this emperor was of promoting learning and the establishment of schools. He there says to the bishops, 'The institution of schools in suitable places for the education of children and the ministers of the church, which you formerly promised us, and which we enjoined upon you, wherever it has not been done, must not be neglected by you.' *Schl.*]

in this matter: for this emperor was a great patron of learning and learned men; he invited men of erudition to his court from all quarters; took delight in their conversation; enlarged the schools and made them respectable, and cherished in particular the Palatine or court school.¹ In Italy, his brother *Lothaire*, emperor from A.D. 823, strove to make learning, now entirely sunk and prostrate, raise its head again by founding schools in eight of the principal cities.² But his efforts appear to have had little effect; for during this whole century, Italy scarcely produced a man of genius.³ In England king *Alfred* obtained great renown, by promoting and honouring literary enterprise.⁴

§ 5. But the infelicity of the times prevented these plans and efforts from imparting that prosperity to erudition, which the rank and power of its patrons might lead us to expect. In the first place, the wars that the sons of *Lewis* the Meek waged with their father, and afterwards between themselves, were great impediments to intellectual improvement in the countries subject to the Franks. In the next place, the incursions and victories of the Normans, which afflicted a large portion of Europe during the whole century, were such an obstruction to the progress of learning, that at the close of the century, in most of these countries, and even in France itself, few remained who deserved to be called learned men.⁵ What little incoherent knowledge remained among the clergy was chiefly confined to the episcopal and monastic schools. But the more the priests and monks increased in wealth and riches, the less they attended to the cultivation of their minds.

§ 6. And yet a large part of this century was adorned with the examples and the labours of men, who derived a literary spirit from *Charles* the Great and his institutions and laws. Among these, in Germany and France, *Rabanus Maurus* held perhaps the first rank; and to his lectures, the studious youth resorted in great numbers. As historians, and not wholly without merit, appeared *Eginhard*, *Freculphus*, *Theganus*, *Haymo*, *Anastasius*, *Ado*, and others. In poetry,

¹ Herm. Conringius, *Antiquitates Academicæ*, p. 320. Cæs. Egass. de Boulay, *Historia Acad. Paris*, i. 178. Jo. Launoy, *de Scholis Caroli M.* c. xi. xii. p. 47, &c. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 483.

² See his ordinance, or *Capitulare*, which is published by Muratori, *Rerum Italicar. Scriptor.* t. i. pt. ii. p. 151. [In this ordinance, the emperor represents the cultivation of literature as wholly prostrate in the Italian states, in consequence of the negligence of the clergy and the civil officers; that he had therefore appointed teachers who should give instruction in the liberal arts; and whom he had directed to use all possible diligence to educate the rising generation. He also mentions the cities in which he had stationed these teachers; namely, Pavia, Ivrea, Turin, Cremona, Florence, Fermo, Verona, Vicenza,

and Forum Julii, or the modern Cividale del Friuli. *Schl.*]

³ See Muratori, *Antiquitates Ital. Medii Ævi*, iii. 829, &c.

⁴ See Ant. Wood, *Historia et Antiqq. Acad. Oxoniensis*, l. i. p. 13, &c. Boulay, *Historia Acad. Paris*, i. 211, and *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. Crit.* i. article *Elfred*, p. 234. [Alfred, whether he was the founder of Oxford or not, was a great patron of learning and learned men. Among his friends are enumerated John of Old Saxony, and Grimbold a monk of St. Bertin, Asser of Me-nevia, Plegmund archbishop of Canterbury, and Werefrith bishop of Worcester. *Ed.*]

⁵ Servatus Lupus, *Epistolæ*, p. 69, ep. xxxiv. Conringius, *Antiqq. Acad.* p. 332. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 251, &c.

Florus, *Walafrid Strabo*, *Bertharius*, *Rabanus*, and others, distinguished themselves. In languages and philology, *Rabanus*, (who wrote acutely concerning the causes and origin of languages,) *Smargadus*, *Bertharius*, and others, possessed skill. Of Greek and Hebrew literature, *William*, *Servatus Lupus*, *John Scotus*, and others, were not ignorant. In eloquence, or the art of speaking and writing with elegance, *Servatus Lupus*, *Eginhard*, *Agobard*, *Hinemar*, and others, were proficient.¹

§ 7. The philosophy and logic taught in the European schools, in this century, scarcely deserved the name. Yet there were, in various places, and especially among the Irish, subtle and acute men, who might not improperly be called philosophers. At the head of these was *John Erigena Scotus*, that is, the Irishman, a companion and friend of *Charles the Bald*, a man of great and excelling genius, and not a stranger to Grecian and Roman learning. Being acquainted with Greek, he expounded *Aristotle* to his pupils; and also philosophized, with great acuteness, without a guide. His five books *on the Division of Nature*, are still extant; an abstruse work, in which he traces the causes and origination of all things, in a style not disagreeable, and with no ordinary acumen; and in which he so explains the philosophy of Christianity as to make it the great aim of the whole system, to bring the minds of men into intimate union with the Supreme Being. To express the thing in words better understood, — he was the first of those who united *Scholastic theology* with that which is called *Mystic*. Some have viewed him as not very far from the opinion which supposes God to be connected with nature, as the soul is with the body. But perhaps he advanced nothing but what the *Realists*, as they were called, afterwards taught: though he expressed his views with less clearness.² He did not, so far as I know, found a new sect. About the same time, one *Mucarius*, also an Irishman, or Scot, disseminated in France that error concerning the soul, which *Averroes* afterwards professed; namely, that all men have one common soul; an error which *Ratramn* confuted.³ Before these men, and in the times of *Charles the Great* and *Lewis the Meek*, *Dungal*, a Scot and a monk, taught philosophy and astronomy in France, with great reputation.⁴ Nearly contemporary with him was *Heiric*, or *Heric*, a monk of Auxerre, a very acute man, who is said to have pursued his investigations in the manner of *Des Cartes*.⁵

¹ Fine illustrations of these remarks may be derived from the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, by the Benedictine monks, iv. 251, 271, &c. and especially from Le Beuf, *Etat des Sciences en France depuis Charlemagne jusqu'au Roi Robert*; in his *Recueil de divers Ecrits pour servir d'éclaircissement à l'Histoire de France*, t. ii. p. 1, &c. Paris, 1738, 8vo.

² This book was published by Thomas Gale, Oxon. 1681, fol. Chr. Aug. Heumann made some extracts from it, and treated leadenly of Scotus himself, in the German *Acta Philosophorum*, t. iii. p. 858, &c.

³ See Jo. Mabillon, *Pref. ad Secul. iv.* pt. ii. *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti*, § 156, &c. p. liii. &c.

⁴ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 493. [But Muratori, *History of Italy*, iv. 611, German ed. and elsewhere, thinks this Dungal taught in Pavia, Italy, and not in the monastery of St. Denys, France. *Th.*]

⁵ Le Beuf, *Mémoires pour l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, ii. 481. *Acta Sanctor. Junii*, iv. ad diem 24, p. 829, et ad diem 31 Julii, p. 249. For this philosopher obtained a place among the saints.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

§ 1. The lives of the clergy very corrupt—§ 2. Causes of this—§ 3. The Roman pontiffs—§ 4. The frauds for establishing their power: popess Joanna—§ 5, 6. Friendship of the popes for the kings of France—§ 7. The emperors suffered their rights in matters of religion to be wrested from them. The power of bishops curtailed—§ 8. Documents forged by the Roman pontiffs. Decretal Epistles—§ 9. Success of these frauds—§ 10. Monks gain access to courts, and to civil offices—§ 11. Attempts to reform their profligate lives—§ 12. Canons and canonesses—§ 13. The principal Greek writers—§ 14. The more distinguished Latins.

§ 1. THE ungodly lives of most of those entrusted with the care and government of the church, are a subject of complaint with all the ingenuous and honest writers of the age.¹ In the East, sinister designs, rancour, contentions, and strife were everywhere predominant. At Constantinople, or New Rome, those were elevated to the patriarchal chair who were in favour at court; and upon losing that favour, a decree of the emperor hurled them from their elevated station. In the West, the bishops hung around the courts of princes, and indulged themselves in every species of voluptuousness:² while

¹ See Agobard, *de Privilegiis et Jure Sacerdotii*, § 13. *Opp.* i. 137, ed. Baluz.

² See Agobard, *passim*; and laws (or canons) enacted in the councils of the Latins; also Servatus Lupus, *Epist.* xxxv. p. 73, 281, and the annotations of Steph. Baluze, p. 371. [The council of Pavia, A.D. 850, canon third, says, 'It is our opinion, that bishops should be contented with *temperate meals*; and should not urge their guests to eat and to drink, but rather set examples of sobriety. Let all provocations to debauchery be removed from their conviviality; let no ludicrous shows, no vain garrulity, no buffoonery of wits, no scurrilous tricks, there find a place.' Harduin's *Concilia*, v. 25. In a subsequent canon, they forbid bishops keeping hounds and hawks for hunting; and their having superfluous trains of horses and mules, and gaudy dresses, for vain display. The council of Aix-la-Chapelle, A.D. 836, forbade bishops getting drunk. Harduin, *Concilia*, iv. 1392, No. 6. And they state, with reprobation, the fact, that some of their order neglected their charges, and travelled here and there, not from necessity, but to gratify their avarice, or their love of pleasure. *Ibid.* p. 1393, No. 12. Of presbyters and the inferior clergy they complain, that they kept women in their houses to the great

scandal of the ministry; and this, notwithstanding the attempts of former councils and princes to remove the evil. Also, that presbyters turn bailiffs, frequent taverns, pursue filthy lucre, practise usury, behave shamefully and lewdly in the houses they visit, and do not blush to indulge in revelry and drunkenness. *Ibid.* p. 1397, Nos. 7, 8. They say of the nunneries,—*quæ in quibusdam locis lupanaria potius videntur esse, quam monasteria.* *Ibid.* p. 1398, No. 12. The council of Mentz, A.D. 888, decreed, 'that the clergy be wholly forbidden to have females resident in their houses. For although there were canons allowing *certain* females [mothers and sisters] to reside in clergymen's houses, yet, what is greatly to be lamented, *Sæpe audivimus, per illam concessionem plurima scelera esse commissa, ita ut quidam sacerdotum cum propriis sororibus concubentes, filios ex eis generassent.* And therefore this holy synod decrees, that no presbyter shall permit *any* female to live with him in his house; so that the occasion of evil reports, or of iniquitous deeds, may be wholly removed.' *Ibid.* vi. 406, No. 10. *Tr.*—In arguing from the enactments of councils to the general state of morality among the clergy, it should be remembered, 1. That the occurrence of one or two offences

the inferior clergy and the monks were sensual; and by the grossest vices corrupted the people whom they were set to reform. The ignorance of the clergy in many places was so great, that few of them could read and write, and very few could express their thoughts with precision and clearness. Hence, whenever a letter was to be penned, or anything of importance was to be committed to writing, recourse was generally had to some one individual, whom common fame invested with a certain dexterity in such matters. The example of *Servatus Lupus* is evidence of the fact.¹

§ 2. Various causes operated in Europe to produce and to foster this corruption of the persons who ought to have been examples to others. Among the principal ones, must be reckoned the calamities of the times, such as the perpetual wars between *Lewis* the Meek, and his sons and posterity, the incursions and ravages of the barbarous nations, the gross ignorance of the nobility, and the vast wealth that was possessed by the churches and monasteries. To these leading causes, others of less magnitude may be added. If anyone among people of illustrious birth, was either indolent or dull, he became a candidate for some high preferment in the church.² Patrons and protectors of religious benefices, because they would not have their vices reprehended, purposely sought out dunces and blockheads for the care of churches, and with it for that of men's salvation.³ The bishops and the heads of monasteries held much real estate or landed property by feudal tenure; wherefore, when a war broke out, they were summoned personally to the camp, attended by the quota of soldiers which they were bound to furnish to their sovereigns.⁴ Kings and princes, moreover, that they might be able to reward their servants and soldiers for their services, often seized upon consecrated property, and gave it to their dependents; in consequence, the priests and monks before supported by it, sought relief for their necessities in committing any sort of crimes, and in contriving impostures.⁵

of each kind would demand the interference of law as peremptorily as a thousand, so that we cannot at all infer anything like general profligacy from these decrees. 2. That as they are almost all the acts of provincial or diocesan councils, they would have to be enacted once at least in each province before they could be held to be binding, and that this may account for their frequent occurrence in the *Acta*. 3. That it was a part of the routine of councils to embody the canons of former and foreign councils, which would often be done when there was no immediate occasion for a particular enactment in the particular district. 4. That no general or public profligacy could exist in the teeth of these enactments, which show that the sense of the majority was the other way. 5. These being allowed for, the amount of direct testimony is very small: and, 6. Many of the offences are of a merely uncanonical not immoral character, as hunting, &c. and others

peculiar to no one particular age or region of the church. *Ed.*]

¹ See his Works, Ep. xcvi. xcix. p. 126, 148, 142; also his *Life*. To these add, Rodolphi Bituricensis, *Capitula ad Clerum suum*; in Baluze, *Miscellanea*, vi. 139 and 148.

² Hinemar, *Opus Posterius contra Godeschalcum*, cap. xxxvi. in his Opp. i. 318. *Servatus Lupus*, *Epist.* lxxix. p. 120.

³ Agobard, *de Privilegiis et Jure Sacerdotum*, cap. xi., Opp. i. 341.

⁴ Stephen Baluze, *Appendix Actorum ad Servatum*, p. 508. Muratori, *Antiqq. Ital. Medii Ævi*, ii. 446, &c. Mabillon, *Annales Benedict.* vi. 587. Du Fresne, ad Joinvillii *Historiam Ludovici* S. p. 75, 76. [Yet military service was not always required for church lands, some donations expressly granting exemption from it. See Mabillon, l. c. *Tr.*]

⁵ Agobard, *de Dispens. Rerum Ecclesiast.*

§ 3. The Roman pontiffs were elected by the suffrages of the whole body of the clergy and people,¹ but the emperors must approve of their appointment before they were consecrated.² There is, indeed, extant an edict of *Lewis the Meek*, dated A.D. 817, in which this right of the emperors is relinquished, and power given to the Romans, not only of electing a pontiff, but also of installing and consecrating him, without waiting for the consent of the emperor:³ but eminent men have shown, by arguments entirely satisfactory, that this document is a forgery.⁴ Yet I readily admit that after the times of *Charles the Bald*, who obtained the imperial dignity by the good offices of the Roman pontiff, the state of things was materially changed, and the consent of the emperors was not asked by the Romans. It is at the same time true beyond a question, that from the time of *Hadrian III.*, who was placed in St. Peter's chair, A.D. 884, the election of a pontiff was nearly destitute of any rule or order, and for the most part tumultuous; nor did this irregularity cease until the times of *Otto the Great*.

§ 4. Few of those who were raised in this century, to the highest station in the church, can be commended for their wisdom, learning, virtue, and other endowments proper for a bishop. The greater part of them, by their numerous vices, and all of them, by their arrogance and lust of power, entailed disgrace upon their memories. Between *Leo IV.*, who died A.D. 855, and *Benedict III.*, a woman, who concealed her sex, and assumed the name of *Johanna*, it is said, opened her way to the pontifical throne by her learning and genius, and governed the church for a time. She is commonly called the *papess Joanna*. During the five subsequent centuries, the witnesses to this extraordinary event are without number: nor did anyone, prior to the reformation by *Luther*, regard the thing as either incredible, or disgraceful to the church.⁵ But in the seventeenth century, learned men, not only among the Roman catholics, but others also, exerted all the powers of their ingenuity both to invalidate the testimony on which the truth of the story rests, and to confute it by an accurate computation of dates.⁶ There are still, however, very learned men who, while

§ 14, Opp. i. 270. Flodoard, *Hist. Eccles. Remensis*, l. iii. c. ix. Servatus Lupus, *Epist.* xlv. p. 87, 437, &c. but especially, Lud. Ant. Muratori, *Antiqq. Italica*, vi. p. 302, &c. and Lud. Thomassin, *Disciplina Ecclesiæ vet. et nova circa Beneficia*, pt. ii. l. iii. c. xi. The custom prevailed also among the Greeks and the Lombards. See Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 142.

¹ [At Rome. Tr.]

² See the illustrious von Büнау, *Historia Imperii German.* iii. 28, &c. 32, &c.

³ Harduin, *Concilia*, iv. 1236. Car. le Cointe, *Annales Ecclesiæ Francor.* t. vii. ad ann. 817, § 6. Baluze, *Capitular. Regum Francor.* i. 591.

⁴ Muratori, *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Eccles.* p. 54, &c. and *Antiquitates Ital. Medii ævi*, iii. 29, 30; where he conjectures that

this document was forged in the eleventh century. Büнау, *Hist. Imper. German.* iii. 34. And yet some popish writers, e.g. Fontanini and others, most earnestly defend this edict of Lewis, though ineffectually. [The evidence of the spuriousness of this edict is well summed up by Pagi, *Critica in Baron*, ad ann. 817, No. 7, t. iii. 492. Tr.]

⁵ The arguments of those who hold the story to be true, are carefully and learnedly collected and stated by Fred. Spanheim, in his *Exercit. de Papa Fæmina*; Opp. ii. 577, and Jac. Lenfant has exhibited them in a French translation, better arranged, and with various additions, in a third ed. at the Hague, 1736, 12mo.

⁶ The arguments of those who deny the existence of a *papess*, after David Blondel's appropriate treatise, and some others, are

they concede that much falsehood is mixed with the truth, maintain that the controversy is not wholly settled. Something must necessarily have taken place at Rome, to give rise to this most uniform report of so many ages; but even yet it is not clear what that something was.¹

§ 5. Great as the vices and enormities of many of the pontiffs were, they did not prevent the growth of the pontifical power and

ingeniously stated by Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, iii. 2162, art. *Papesse*. See also Geo. Ecard, *Historia Franciæ Oriental.* tom. ii. lib. xxx. § 119, &c. p. 436, &c. who, however, so far as we know, has followed the reasoning of Leibnitz on the subject. Michael le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 777, and in the Lutheran church, Chr. Aug. Heumann, in his *Sylloge Diss. Sacrar.* tom. i. pt. ii. p. 352, &c. The arguments on both sides of the question are neatly stated by Christopher Wagenseil; in Jo. Geo. Schellhorn's *Amœnitates Litterar.* pt. i. p. 146, &c. and by Jac. Basnage, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, i. 408. The names of the other writers, who are very numerous, may be seen in Casp. Sagittarius, *Introductio in Hist. Eccles.* t. i. c. xxv. p. 676, &c. and in the *Bibliotheca Bremensis*, t. viii. pt. v. p. 935. [See also Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxii. 75—110. J. E. C. Schmidt, *Kirchengesch.* iv. 274—279, and A. Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, iv. 246—260. Tr.]

¹ So thought Paul Sarpi, *Lettere Italiane*, lett. lxxxii. p. 452. Jac. Lenfant, *Biblioth. Germanique*, x. 27. Theod. Hasæus, *Biblioth. Bremens.* t. viii. pt. v. p. 935. Christ. Matth. Pfaff, *Instit. Histor. Eccles.* p. 402, ed. 2. To whom might be added Wernsdorf, Boecler, Holberg, and many others. I will not undertake the office of judge in this controversy, yet I am of opinion there was something in this affair that deserves further investigation. [Few, if any, in modern times admit the reality of a *female pope*; and, among the English, Pope Joan has become a proverbial epithet, for a fictitious character, which is too ridiculous to be mentioned in serious earnest. None of the contemporary writers mention such a pope; for the passage in Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who then lived at Rome, and wrote the *Lives of the Popes*, is undoubtedly spurious. (An *eye-witness* could not have written, '*It is said*, that a female succeeded to Leo IV.' if he had known it as a *fact*; nor would he have given currency to such a *falsehood*, had he known it to be such. Nor is this the only proof that the passage is an interpolation.) It was nearly two centuries before any writer affirmed the fact. [There is no authority for it unsuspected of forgery or interpolation before the thirteenth century. *Ed.*] But from that time to the reformation it was generally believed. Yet

not *universally*, as Mosheim intimates. Platina (*Lives of the Popes*, John VII.), after relating the story, says, '*Hæc quæ dixi, vulgo feruntur, incertis tamen et obscuris auctoribus: quæ ideo ponere breviter et nude institui, ne obstinate et pertinaciter omissem videar, quod fere omnes affirmant.*' This surely is not the language of one who does not question the truth of the story. Yet Platina wrote before Luther was born. — The history of this *papesse* is briefly this, as stated by writers of the twelfth and following centuries. She was the daughter of an English missionary, who had left England to preach among the newly-converted Saxons. She was born at Ingelheim; and, according to different authors, was named Joanna, Agnes, Gerbert, Isabel, Margaret, Dorothy, and Jutt. She early distinguished herself for genius and love of learning. A young monk of Fulda, conceiving a passion for her, which was mutual, she eloped from her parents, disguised her sex, and entered the monastery of Fulda. Not satisfied with the restraints there, she and her lover eloped again, went to England, and then to France, Italy, and finally to Athens in Greece, where they devoted themselves to literary pursuits. On the death of the monk, Joanna was inconsolable. She left Athens, and repaired to Rome. There she opened a school, and acquired such reputation for learning and feigned sanctity, that on the death of Leo IV. A.D. 855, she was chosen pope. For something more than two years she filled the papal chair with reputation, no one suspecting her sex. But she had taken one of her household, whom she could trust, to her bed, and by him she became pregnant. At length, being nearer her time than she had supposed, she ventured, in Whitsun-week, to join in the annual procession with all her clergy. While passing the street between the church of St. Clement and the Amphitheatre, she was seized with violent pains, fell to the ground, amidst the crowd, and while her attendants were endeavouring to minister to her, was delivered of a son. The child died, and some say, the mother too, on the spot. Others say, she survived, but was sent immediately to prison, the object of universal execration. See Bower and Platina, *l. cit.* Tr.]

influence, both in church and state, during these unhappy times. It does not, indeed, appear, from any authentic documents, that they acquired any new *territories* in addition to those which they had received from the bounty of the Frank kings. For the things told us of the donations of *Lewis the Meek*, are destitute of probability:¹ nor is there more certainty in what many state, that *Charles the Bald*, in the year 875, when *John VIII.* had enabled him to gain the rank of emperor, relinquished all right and jurisdiction over the city of Rome and its territory, and bestowed various other gifts, of immense value, upon the pontiffs. Yet it must be obvious, to all who read the history of those times, that the Roman pontiffs advanced in power, influence, wealth, and riches, from the age of *Lewis the Meek*; and especially after the commencement of the reign of *Charles the Bald*.²

§ 6. Upon the decease of *Lewis II.*,³ a violent war broke out among the descendants of *Charles the Great*, each of them contending for the imperial dignity. The Roman pontiff, *John VIII.*, and with him the Italian princes, eagerly seized this opportunity to exclude the voice of all foreigners, and make the election of emperors depend wholly on them. Hence *Charles the Bald*, the king of the Franks, by a vast amount of money and other presents, and by still greater promises, obtained from the Roman pontiff and the other Italian princes, to be proclaimed king of Italy and emperor of the Romans, in a public assembly, A.D. 876. His successors in the kingdom of Italy and in the imperial dignity, *Carloman* and *Charles the Fat*, were likewise chosen by the Roman pontiff and the Italian princes. After them turbulent times came on, in which those who promised most, or who gave most, generally ascended the royal and imperial throne, by the aid of the pontiffs.⁴

§ 7. The power of the Roman pontiffs in matters of a religious nature, was augmented with equal rapidity and success; and nearly from the same causes. Even among Roman Catholic writers, the wisest and most impartial, acknowledge and prove that from the time of *Lewis the Meek*, the ancient system of ecclesiastical law in Europe was gradually changed, and a new one substituted for it, by the policy of the court of Rome. The kings and emperors suffered their rights, in matters of religion, which had been handed down to them from *Charles the Great*, to be insensibly taken from them. The competence of bishops, to make regulations in matters of religion, declined; and the authority of ecclesiastical councils was diminished. For the Roman pontiffs, exulting in their prosperity and the daily accessions to their wealth, endeavoured to instil into the minds of all, and they did, notwithstanding the opposition of the reflecting, and of those acquainted with the ancient ecclesiastical constitution, actually instil into many, the sentiment that the bishop of Rome was constituted,

¹ See above, § 3.

² Bünau, *Historia Imperii Germani*. iii. 482, &c. Jo. Geo. Eccard, *Hist. Franciæ Orientali*. ii. 606, &c. lib. xxxi.

³ [A.D. 875. Tr.]

⁴ This is illustrated by Carql. Sigonius, *de Regno Italiæ*, and by the other writers of German and Italian history.

by *Jesus Christ*, a legislator and judge over the whole church; and, therefore, that other bishops derived all their authority solely from him; and that councils could decide nothing without his direction and approbation.¹

§ 8. That men might lend more readily ears and acquiescence to this new system of ecclesiastical law, so very different from the old one, there was need of ancient documents and records with which it might be enforced and defended against the assaults of opponents. Hence the Roman pontiffs procured the forgery, by trusty friends, of conventions, acts of councils, epistles, and other documents; which made it seem that from the earliest ages of the church, their predecessors possessed all the majesty and power, now claimed by themselves.² Among these fraudulent supports of the Romish power, the so-called *Decretal Epistles* of the pontiffs of the first centuries, hold perhaps the first rank. They were produced by the ingenuity of an obscure man who falsely assumed the name of *Isidore*, a Spanish bishop.³ Some vestiges of these fabricated epistles appear in the preceding century;⁴ but they were first published, and appealed to in support of the claims of the Roman pontiffs in this century.⁵ Of

¹ See the excellent work of an unknown writer, who signs himself D. B. entitled, *Histoire du Droit Ecclésiastique Publique François*, first published, London, 1737, 2 vols. 8vo, and lately republished splendidly in a larger form. The author neatly and acutely points out the steps by which the Roman pontiffs advanced their power. Of the ninth century, he treats in vol. i. p. 160, &c. [Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vols. iv. and v.—G. J. Planck, *Gesch. d. Christl. Kirchl. Gesellschafts-Verfassung*, vols. ii. and iii. Tr.]

² It is no improbable supposition, that these and other documents, such as the donations of Constantine and Lewis the Meek, were fabricated with the privity and approbation of the Roman pontiffs. For, who can believe that the pontiffs, who made use of these writings during many ages to substantiate their authority and their prerogatives, would have ventured to confront kings, princes, ecclesiastical councils and bishops, with the fictions and impostures of private individuals? In that age, frauds for the benefit of the church, and of God, were deemed lawful; so that it is not strange that the Roman pontiffs should suppose they did no moral wrong by permitting and approving the fabrication of such charters as would be a rampart and bulwark to the see of St. Peter.

³ That the author of these Epistles wished to be regarded as Isidore, a distinguished Spanish bishop of the sixth century; or, to speak more definitely, that he wished to make the world believe that these Epistles were collected by Isidore, is perfectly clear. See Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. Medii*

Ævi, v. 561. The bishops were accustomed, in token of their humility, to subjoin to their names the word *peccator* (*sinner*); hence the author of this forgery annexed the surname *Peccator*, to the assumed name of Isidore. Some of the transcribers, ignorant of the ancient customs and literature, corrupted this signature by exchanging *Peccator* for *Mercator*. And hence the fraudulent compiler of the *Decretal Epistles* is called *Isidorus Mercator*.

⁴ See Aug. Calmet, *Histoire de Lorraine*, i. 528. Just. Henn. Böhmer, *Pref. ad Novam Editionem Juris Canon.* t. i. p. x. xix. Notes. [‘They crept to light near the close of the eighth century.’ Fleury, in *Histor. Eccles.* diss. iv. § 1. Tr.]

⁵ The spuriousness of these Epistles has been demonstrated, not only by the *Centuriatores Magdeburgenses* and some others, but most learnedly and in an appropriate treatise, by David Blondel, in his *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vulpantes*, Genev. 1628, 4to. And at the present day, the friends of the Roman pontiffs, who follow reason and truth, confess the cheat. See Jo. Fran. Buddeus, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, ii. 762. Add, Peter Coustant, *Prolegom. ad Epistolas Pontificum*, t. i. p. cxxx. &c. Fleury, Diss. prefixed to his *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, t. xvi. [and still better, in his *Histoire Ecclésiastique* itself, liv. xlii. § xxii. These Epistles, bearing the names of various popes, from Clement I. to Damasus I. A.D. 384, are in the early collection of councils by Binius, but are not inserted in the *Bullarium Magnum* of Cherubini, published by authority of the court of Rome, near the close of the 17th century. It is believed

similar origin and value are the decrees of a Roman council, said to have been held under *Sylvester*, (A.D. 324,) but which was never known of by anyone till the ninth century; and, than which nothing could be better suited to enrich the Roman pontiff, and exalt him above all human authority.¹

§ 9. There were, indeed, among the western bishops, some discerning men, who perceived that designs were formed against them and the church; in particular, the French bishops made a vehement resistance to the concession of any place for these epistles, and other spurious wares, among the rules of sacred jurisprudence. But these men were overcome by the pertinacity of the Roman pontiffs, especially by that of *Nicolas I.* And as all science and learning, in the following period, retired from the Latin world, there scarcely remained anyone capable, or even willing, to move a controversy respecting these pious frauds. How great the evils were to which they gave rise, and how audaciously the Roman pontiffs abused them, to overthrow the ancient system of church government, to weaken the authority of bishops, to increase their own revenues and emoluments, and to abridge the prerogatives of kings and princes, numberless facts in the history of the subsequent centuries will show. Nor is this denied, at the present day, by respectable and honest men, even though in other respects favourably disposed towards the Romish church and its head.²

§ 10. The estimation in which a monastic life was held, was astonishingly great, both in the eastern empire and in the western. In the former, this excessive estimation had long existed; but among the Latins, it takes date only from the preceding century. Hence

they are now universally given up. The oldest papal epistles now admitted by any to be genuine, are those collected by Dionysius Exiguus; who says he could find none by the pontiffs anterior to Siricius, who succeeded Damasus I. A.D. 385. The earliest in the *Bullarium Magnum* are those of Leo I. A.D. 447. *Tr.*—The general conclusion with regard to this question is, that the Decretals were forged in Germany, probably by Benedict of Mentz, the corruptor of the Capitularies, between 829 and 845; and with a view of promoting the independence of the clergy, and the rights of bishops against their metropolitans. This view exonerates the papal court from the forgery; but it is certain that they were adopted and quoted by the popes as soon as they became known. See Robertson, *Ch. Hist.* ii. 269—271, 317. Gieseler, ii. 324. *Ed.*]

¹ See Jo. Launoy, *de Cura Ecclesiæ erga Pauperes et Miseros*, cap. i. observ. i. p. 576, of his *Opp.* t. ii. pt. ii. [Likewise Jo. Cabassut, *Notitia Ecclesiast.* p. 132, and Pagi, *Critica in Baron.* ad ann. 324, § xvii. xviii. who do not hesitate to pronounce this council a fiction. *Tr.*]

² See Jo. Launoy, *de Regia Potestate in*

Causis Matrimonial. in his *Opp.* t. i. pt. ii. p. 764, and Peter Coustant, *Præf. ad Epist. Romanor. Pontiff.* t. i. p. cxxvii. &c. [Fleury, *Diss.* vii. § v. in *Historiam Eccles.* says, 'Falsæ Isidori Decretales, circa octavi finem sæculi invectæ, jurisdictionem ecclesiasticam in tribus articulis admodum concesserunt, scilicet quoad concilia, judicia episcoporum, et appellationes.' See also diss. iv. § 1, &c. —Peter de Marca, *de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, lib. vii. cap. xx. § 1, &c. 'Sub secunda Regum nostrorum dynastia novum jus canonicum in ecclesiam Gallicanam, æque ac in ceteras Occidentis provincias, introduci cæptum est, inventis eam in rem suppositiis illis veterum Pontificum Romanorum epistolis, in quibus extant quam plurima constituta prorsus adversa veterum canonum statutis." But while these, and other Roman Catholic writers, trace the commencement of a great revolution in the constitution of the Catholic church to the *Decretal Epistles*, and other forgeries of the eighth and ninth centuries, they say it was only the commencement; for the revolution was not completed till after the publication of the *Decretum* of Gratian, in the twelfth century. *Tr.*]

even kings, and dukes, and counts, abandoning their honours and their wealth, voluntarily retired to monasteries, to devote themselves to the service of God. Of this no small number of examples occurred in Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, during this century; and there were some also in the preceding century. Those who, in their lifetime, could not bring themselves to the resolution of abandoning society, would yet demand the monastic garb, when dying, and actually put it on, before they left the world; that they might enjoy the prayers and spiritual succours of the fraternity, among whom they had been received. Another and a striking proof of the high estimation in which monks were held, is the custom of the emperors and kings of the Franks, in this age, of calling monks and abbots to their courts, and entrusting them with civil affairs, and business of great moment, both at home and in foreign countries. For those unsuspecting princes thought, that no persons could more safely be entrusted with the management of public affairs, than men of such sanctity and piety, as to have subdued all their natural desires, and stripped off every lust. Hence it is, that, in the history of these times, we meet with so many abbots and monks, who performed civil functions as ambassadors or *missi*,¹ that is, extraordinary judges, often with good success, but with bad not seldom.

§ 11. And yet those who conferred such honours upon monks and the monastic life, did not deny, that most of that class lived vicious lives; and they laboured to reform their morals, and recall them to obedience to their monastic rules. The efforts of *Lewis* the Meek especially, in this particular, deserve notice. That emperor employed *Benedict*, abbot of Aniane, and afterwards of Indre, a man distinguished for piety and the fear of God, to reform the monasteries, first in Aquitaine, and then throughout the kingdom of France, and to purge them of the enormous vices which had crept into them; and afterwards, in the council² of Aix-la-Chapelle, A.D. 817, in which the same *Benedict* presided, he caused good laws to be enacted, for restoring monastic discipline, which had completely sunk. This *Benedict*, accordingly, who has been called the second father of the western monks, allowed none of them any other rule than that of *Benedict* of Monte Cassino, suppressing the diversity of rites and customs, and making the entire body live in one uniform way: he also cleared monasteries of the graver vices; finally, he no longer suffered monastic establishments to be independent of each other, but made all of them members, as it were, of a single corporation or society.³

¹ [*Missi*, apud scriptores nostros proprie dicebantur, qui e palatio in civitates et provincias extra ordinem mittebantur a principe cum amplissima potestate, ut de omnibus causis quæ ad correctionem pertinere viderentur, quanto possent studio, per semetipsos regia auctoritate corrigerent: et si aliqua difficultas in qualibet re eis obstitet, ad regis seu imperatoris notitiam deferre curarent: deinde ut inquirerent

quomodo hi qui populum regere deberent, unusquisque in suo ministerio se custoditum haberet, quique gratiarum actione, et qui correctione et increpatione digni haberentur.]

Du Cange, in voc. S.]

² [Of abbots. Tr.]

³ See Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. sæcul. iv. pt. i. præf. p. xxvii. and præf. ad sæcul. v. p. xxv.* also his *Annales Ordinis S. Bened. ii. 430, &c.* and many

This discipline flourished for awhile; but from various causes it gradually declined: and at the end of this century, such devastations had everywhere been made, both in church and state, that only some slight traces of it remained in a few places.

§ 12. The order of canons, which was devised by *Chrodegang*, and had been extensively introduced in the preceding century, *Lewis* the Meek cherished with great care, and extended through all the provinces of his empire. He also added an order of *canonesses*, which had been unknown in the Christian world till that time.¹ A rule for each of these, he caused to be drawn up in the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, superseding the rule of *Chrodegang*; and these new rules continued to be followed in most of the convents of canons and canonesses, till the twelfth century, although they were disagreeable to the court of Rome. The compiler of the rule for *canons* was undoubtedly *Amalarius*, a presbyter of Metz; but whether he also drew up that for *canonesses*, is uncertain.² From this time onward, numerous convents of canons and canonesses were founded in every part of Europe, and endowed with ample revenues, by pious indi-

other places in that volume. Aug. Calmet, *Histoire de Lorraine*, i. 596. Concerning Benedict of Aniane, and his merits generally, see the *Acta Sanctor.* Febr. ii. 606, and *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 447, &c. [This Benedict appears to have been a very sincere man, and a great reformer of the monasteries; that is, one who brought them to greater uniformity in dress, living, worship, and usages. He was himself most rigorous in voluntary mortifications; and the rule of St. Benedict he revered as if it had come immediately from God, and was the only true guide to heaven. See below § 14, note. *Tr.*]

¹ See Mabillon, *Annales Ord. Bened.* ii. 428, &c.

² Lud. Thomassin, *Disciplina Eccles. Vetus et Nova*, pt. i. l. iii. c. 42, 43, &c. Muratori, *Antiquitates Ital. Medii Ævi*, v. 185, 540, &c. and all the writers who treat of the order of canons, though they are not all of equal value. The least worthy of credit are those who, belonging themselves to the order of canons, have treated of the origin and progress of that order; as, e.g. Raymund Chapponel, *Histoire des Chanoines*, Paris, 1699, 8vo. For these writers are so attached to the order, that they usually trace its origin back to Christ himself and his Apostles, or at least to the first ages of the Christian church. [This ordinance of Lewis, for regulating the order of canons, is in Harduin's *Concilia*, iv. 1055—1180. The following abstract, by Schlegel, contains its most essential features:—‘It contains 145 articles, of which the first 113 are mere extracts from the fathers and acts of councils,

describing the duties of bishops and priests. These are followed by two sermons of Augustine, on living in associations. Then commence the rules framed by this council. First, the prevailing error, that the prescriptions of the Gospel were obligatory only upon monks and clergymen is confuted, and then the distinction between monks and canons is defined. The latter may wear linen, eat flesh, hold private property, and enjoy that of the church; the former cannot. Yet, equally with the monks, they should avoid all vices and practise virtue. They should live in well-secured cloisters, containing dormitories, refectories, and other necessary apartments. The number of canons in each cloister should be proportioned to the exigencies of the church to which it belonged. In their dress they should avoid the extravagances of ornament and finery, and likewise uncleanness and negligence, &c. The second part of the rule relates to *canonesses*, and contains twenty-eight articles. The first six are extracts from the fathers, and relate to the duties of ladies who consecrate themselves to God. They may have private property; yet must commit the management of it to some kinsman or friend, by a public act or assignment. They may also have waiting-maids, and eat in the refectory and sleep in the dormitory. They are to be veiled, and to dress in black. Their business must be prayer, reading, and labouring with their hands; and especially, they must fabricate their own clothing from the flax and wool given to them.’ *Tr.*]

viduals. But this institution, like the others, very soon degenerated widely from the plan of its originators.¹

§ 13. Of the Greek writers these are the most distinguished. *Photius*, patriarch of Constantinople, a man of superior talents, and of various and extensive knowledge. His *Bibliotheca*,² Epistles, and other writings, are yet highly valuable.—*Nicephorus*, also patriarch of Constantinople, who wrote against the opposers of images, and some other works.³—*Theodorus Studites* is likewise indebted to the controversy respecting images, for the greater part of his reputation among those who have come after him.⁴ Not much better or more

¹ Calmet, *Histoire de Lorraine*, i. 591. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 536, &c.

² See Camusat, *Histoire des Journaux*, i. 87, &c. [Photius was of noble parentage, well educated, and perhaps the greatest genius of his age. He certainly was a great scholar. While in civil life he cultivated all learning, sacred and profane; he was commander of the imperial guards, first senator of Constantinople, and chief secretary to the emperor. Before going as ambassador to Bagdad, he wrote, for the benefit of his brother, Tarasius, his famous *Bibliotheca*, or *Μυρίσβιβλον*, giving a critical account of 280 authors which he had read, and frequently also summaries of their contents, with considerable extracts. As many of these authors are no longer extant, the account of them by Photius is extremely valuable. In 858, the emperor Michael III. deposed Ignatius, the patriarch of Constantinople, and Photius was ordained sub-deacon, deacon, priest and patriarch, in four successive days. The friends of Ignatius and the bishops of Rome refused to acknowledge Photius as a legitimate patriarch. Yet he held the office till 867; when, having offended the emperor, he was deposed, and Ignatius was restored. But in 877 Ignatius died, and Photius again took the chair, till 886, when the new emperor, Leo the Philosopher, deposed and banished him to a convent in Armenia, where he died about 890. The *Bibliotheca* of Photius, Gr. and Lat. with the notes of Hæschelius (the very faulty Latin by Schott), was first published 1601, fol. and has been several times reprinted. A better edition was promised in the last century, but not produced. His Epistles, to the number of 248, were published Gr. and Lat. by R. Montague, Lond. 1651, fol. His *Nomocanon*, or collection of eccl. canons, embracing xiv. *Tituli*, with the Commentary of Theod. Balsamon, was published Gr. and Lat. by both the Justells; the last in his *Biblioth. Juris Canon.* ii. 789. Paris, 1662. Several additional letters and tracts have crept to light in different collections; but his extensive commentaries on scripture, his large lexicon, and several smaller works, remain

still in MS. — For an account of his writings, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. ix. p. 381—519. Of his public life, and the controversies in which he was involved, notice will be taken in the next chapter, § 27, &c. *Tr.*]

³ See the *Acta Sanctor.* ii. Martii, ii. 293. ad diem xiii. Oudin, *Scriptores Eccles.* ii. 2, &c. [Nicephorus, after being secretary of state at Constantinople and in high honour, retired from the world and became a monk. He was learned, devout, and exceedingly zealous for image-worship. He was made patriarch of Constantinople A.D. 806; but was expelled his see ten years after by Leo V., who was opposed to image worship, and died in exile, A.D. 828. His best work is a *Compendious History*, from Maurice, A.D. 600 to A.D. 769, extant in the *Corpus Hist. Byzantinæ*. He also wrote a *Chronologia Tripartita*, or a Catalogue of public men, among the Hebrews, Greeks, Latins, &c. and a *Στιχομετρία*, or Index of canonical, ecclesiastical and apocryphal books; annexing to each the number of lines (στίχοι) it contained. Besides these historical works he wrote a long epistle to pope Leo III. containing his creed; several small collections of canons, and a number of books in defence of image-worship. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Theodorus Studites was born at Constantinople A.D. 759, became a monk in 781, abbot in 794, and four years after, head of the monastery of Studius in Constantinople, whence his surname Studites. He was zealous, even to madness, in favour of image-worship; and for thirty years was the instigator of rebellions, and the dauntless leader of them (when out of prison) against the government, which was opposed to image-worship. He did A.D. 826, aged 67. Besides a few tracts on monkery, and monkish saints, he has left us 134 catechetical Discourses, and a vast number of inflammatory letters, in defence of image-worship, most of which, or at least parts of them, Baronius has inserted in his Annals. He was a man of some learning and talent; but wasted all his strength on the controversy respecting images. *Tr.*]

learned were *Theodorus Graptus*, who suffered much in defence of image-worship;¹ *Methodius*, entitled the Confessor, because no penalties or pressure could induce him to abandon the defence of images;² *Theodorus Abucara*,³ *Petrus Siculus*,⁴ *Nicetas David*,⁵ and others, whose names would perhaps have not been handed down to this day, had not the Greeks been involved in contests with the Latins on several subjects, and among themselves respecting image-worship.—Among the Syrians the name of *Moses Barcephala* is famous, and not undeservedly; for he possessed genius, and skill in writing, beyond most others, as his works evince.⁶

¹ [Theodorus Graptus was a monk of Palestine, went to Constantinople, A.D. 818, to plead the cause of image-worship, was banished four times for his abuse of emperors and others, and his seditious movements in favour of images; and at last died in exile, about 840. He has left us a Dispute, an Epistle, and a Creed; all in defence of images. *Tr.*]

² [Methodius Confessor was well born, at Syracuse in Sicily, went to Constantinople, and there became a monk. About A.D. 820, the patriarch sent him as his envoy to Rome. Here he was accused of adultery, but proved his innocence. Returning to Constantinople, he became very zealous in defence of image-worship, was banished, and imprisoned, and whipped. But in 842 he was made patriarch of Constantinople. He died A.D. 847; and has left us five orations, in praise of monkery, and a collection of *Canones Penitentiales*. Some of his orations have passed for works of Methodius Patrensis, who flourished A.D. 290. *Tr.*]

³ Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, tom. i. p. 35, &c. [The word Abucara signifies *bishop of Caria*. He followed the party of Photius, but afterwards renounced it and joined that of Ignatius. According to Cave, he flourished A.D. 867. He has left us about forty Dissertations, Doctrinal and Polemic, against heretics, Jews, and Mahomedans; which were published, Gr. and Lat., by Jac. Gretser, with the *Hodegus* of Anastasius. Ingolstadt, 1606, 4to. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Peter Siculus (fl. A.D. 870), was a learned nobleman, whom Basil I. sent to negotiate an exchange of prisoners in Armenia. There he became acquainted with the sect of the new Manichæans, or Paulicians; the history of whose origin, progress, and decline, he afterwards composed; published Gr. and Lat. Ingolstadt, 1604, 4to, and partially in Latin, by Baronius, *Annal.* t. ix.; and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. xxii. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Nicetas David, a learned bishop of Paphlagonia, flourished about 880, and was strongly attached to the party of Ignatius, whose life he composed, full of reproaches against Photius. He also wrote encomiums on the twelve apostles, and several other

saints; a defence of the synod of Chalcedon, and a commentary on some parts of Greg. Naz. His life of Ignatius was published, Gr. and Lat., with the Acts of the eighth general Council, Ingolstadt, 1604, 4to; and in Harduin's *Concilia*, v. 944—1009. *Tr.*]

⁶ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vaticana*, ii. 127, &c. [Moses Barcephala probably flourished near the close of the next century; Cave says about A.D. 990. See cent. x. pt. ii. c. 2, § 13, note.

The Greek writers omitted by Dr. Mosheim, are the following:—

Nicephorus, Chartophylax, who flourished, perhaps, A.D. 801, and wrote two Epistles to Theodosius, a monk of Corinth, containing solutions of several difficult questions in Ethics; extant, Gr. and Lat., in the *Jus Gr. et Roman.* l. v. p. 341, and Lat. in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. xii.

Josephus, archbishop of Thessalonica, brother of Theodorus Studites, and also a zealot for image-worship. He was deposed A.D. 809, exiled, and died after 816. Gretser (*de Cruce*, ii. 1200) has published, Gr. and Lat., an Oration of his, on the Exaltation of the Holy Cross; and Baronius (*Annales*, ad ann. 808, § 22) has given us an Epistle of his in Latin.

Ignatius, a grammarian and deacon at Constantinople, and then metropolitan of Nice. He flourished A.D. 810, and was alive A.D. 828. His life of the patriarch Tarasius is extant, Lat. in Surius, and in Bolland on Feb. 25th. His life of the patriarch Nicephorus was published, Gr. and Lat., by Henschenius, and Papebroch, on March 13th.

Naucratius, a monk of Constantinople, very active in favour of image-worship, for which he was often imprisoned. He flourished from 813 till after 820. Several letters addressed to him are given us by Baronius; and a very long one of his, containing an account of the sufferings of the image-worshippers, is inserted, Latin, in the *Biblioth. Patr.* xiv. 903. Cave (*Hist. Lit.* t. ii.) gives a specimen of the Greek, but did not deem it worth publishing entire.

Theophanes, the brother of Theodorus Graptus, and of the same character, conduct, and fortune. Yet he became metropolitan

§ 14. At the head of the Latin writers may justly be placed *Rabanus Maurus*, whose last office was that of archbishop of Mentz. He was the common preceptor of Germany and France, with whom no one in this century can be compared, either for genius or extent of learning, or the multitude of books that he composed. Whoever acquaints himself with the opinions of Rabanus Maurus, learns all that the best of the Latins thought and believed for about four centuries, for his writings were in the hands of all the learned.¹ *Agobard* of

of Nice, about 845. We have a Hymn, consisting of nine odes, in memory of his brother; edited by Combes, Gr. and Lat., in his *Orig. Constantinop.* p. 224.

Michael Syncellus, head of a monastery at Constantinople, a zealot for image-worship, in which cause he suffered much. He flourished about 830; and wrote an Encomium on St. Dionys. Areop. which is extant, Gr. and Lat., in the *Opp. Dionys. Areop.* ii. 207; also an Encomium on the holy angels and archangels of God; extant, Gr. and Lat., in Combes, *Auctuar.* Nov. i. 1525.

George Hamartolus, an Archimandrite, who flourished about A.D. 842, and wrote a *Chronicon* from the creation to A.D. 842, which still exists in MS. From it the succeeding chronologists, Cedrenus, Theophanes, Glycas, &c., have copied all that is valuable.

Ignatius, son of the emperor Michael Curopalata, castrated and banished by Leo the Armenian, lived a monk about thirty years, was made patriarch of Constantinople A.D. 847; quarrelled with Bardas, and was deposed and banished A.D. 858. In the year 867, Photius, his competitor, was deposed, and Ignatius restored. He died in 878, aged 80 years. Two letters and one discourse of his are extant, Latin, in Harduin's *Concilia*, v. 791, 872, 937.

Metrophanes, metropolitan of Smyrna, A.D. 858, 859, and 867—880. He was a strenuous opposer of Photius, and rose as he fell. He has left us a letter, giving us the history of Photius from 858 to 870; which is extant, in Latin, in Baronius, *Annales*, ad ann. 870, § 453; and Gr. and Lat. in Harduin's *Concilia*, v. 1111.

Basil the Macedonian, Greek emperor from A.D. 867—886. He wrote exhortations to his son Leo, some orations, addresses, and epistles, still extant; besides some things which are lost.

Michael Psellus, a philosopher who flourished A.D. 870, is supposed to have written some of the pieces which go under the name of another Michael Psellus that lived in the eleventh century; particularly a paraphrase on most of the books of Aristotle, a Dialogue on the operations of demons, a tract concerning demons, &c.

Stylianus, surnamed Mapa, metropolitan of Neo-Cesarea in the *Provincia Euphra-*

tensis, who flourished about 870. He was a strong partisan of Ignatius, in opposition to Photius; for which he suffered a temporary deprivation of his see. He has left us two Epistles, Gr. and Lat., in Harduin's *Concilia*, v. 1122, 1130.

Michael, the monk, Syncellus to the patriarch Ignatius; flourished A.D. 878; and wrote an Encomium on Ignatius; extant, Gr. and Lat., in Harduin's *Concilia*, v. 1009; and a life of Theodorus Studites, from which Baronius, in his *Annales*, has made various extracts.

George, chartophylax of the great church at Constantinople, and archbishop of Nicomedia, about A.D. 880. He was a warm friend of Photius. Several orations, and some poems of his, in praise of saints, are extant, Gr. and Lat., in Combes, *Auctuar.* Nov. Paris, 1648, i. 995.

Leo the Philosopher, Greek emperor from 886 to 911. See cent. x. pt. ii. c. 1, note.

Nicolaus, surnamed Mysticus, patriarch of Constantinople, from 892 to 903, when he was deposed and banished for opposing the divorce of the empress, and the marriage of another. But in 911 he was restored, and lived till 924. He has left us eight Epistles; extant, in the *Concilia*, or in Baronius' *Annales*. Tr.]

¹ See the *Acta Sanctor.* Febr. i. 500. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 151. [Also Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* vi. 1—45.—Rabanus, or Hrabanus, surnamed Maurus, was of French descent, and born of respectable parentage, at Mentz, A.D. 776. He studied first at Fulda, where he was made deacon in 801. The next year he removed to Tours, to study under the famous Alcuin. After one or two years, he returned to Fulda, and was made head of the school there, at the age of twenty-eight. As an instructor, he was so celebrated as to draw young men of talents from a great distance. Among his pupils were, Walafrid Strabo, Servatus Lupus, and others, who were among the first scholars of their age. In 822, he was made abbot of Fulda, in which office he was for a time popular; but at length the monks complained, that he was so engaged in writing books as to neglect his active duties. He now resigned his abbacy, and retired to a literary life. This was in 842. Five years

Lyons, a man of character and discernment, and not destitute of learning, would have deserved more commendation, if he had not been a defender of the rebellion of the sons of *Lewis* the Meek against their own father.¹ *Hilduin* obtained notoriety by his work entitled *Areopagitica*.² *Eginhard*, abbot of Seligenstadt, the celebrated author of the life of *Charles* the Great, and of other works, was distinguished for the neatness of his style, and was not destitute of other excellences.³ *Claudius* of Turin is in reputation at this day, for his exposition of certain books of Scripture, and for his *Chronology*.⁴

after, he was made archbishop of Mentz; in which office he continued till his death, A.D. 856.—He wrote commentaries on all the canonical books, and several of the apocryphal; also sermons, letters, and tracts. Most of his works, as published, are comprised in six vols. folio, Cologne, 1627. *Tr.*—In his *Penitential*, published at Ingolstadt, by P. Steuart, in 1616, in tom. *Insignium Auctorum tam Græcorum quam Latinorum*, is a mutilated but most decisive testimony against transubstantiation. It mentions an identification of the sacramental elements with *our Lord's very body and blood born of the Virgin Mary, as a recent and erroneous opinion*. Something then is lost; but he goes on to say, *to which error, as far as we could, writing to abbot Egilo, we opened what is truly to be believed of the body itself*. When transubstantiation was making its way to general belief, a witness of such importance branding it with novelty and error, naturally became obnoxious; and William of Malmsbury, in a liturgical MS. presented by Henry VI. to All Souls' College, Oxford, and yet preserved there, attacks Raban for attributing to the eucharist the qualities of ordinary food. See Soames's *Bampton Lectures*. 414, 417. *S.*—Malmsb. Opp. p. 1771, ed. Migne. *Ed.*]

¹ Colonia, *Histoire Littér. de la Ville de Lyon*, ii. 93. *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. Critique*, i. 178, *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 567, &c. [and Cave's *Hist. Litt. t. ii.* Agobard was a Frank, called from Spain to be coadjutor of Leidrad, archbishop of Lyons, A.D. 813, whom he afterwards succeeded. He was a man of an ardent, independent mind, of great learning and inflexibility. He attacked the superstitions of the age, so far as he discovered them, with boldness; was very zealous against the Jews, to whom the French kings were disposed to grant privileges; and taking sides with Lothaire and Pipin against their father Lewis the Meek, he went so far, that on a reconciliation between those sovereigns, he was deprived of his bishopric. However, he was restored, and held his office till his death in 840. He attacked Felix of Urgel; wrote against image-worship, against the trial by ordeal, and against the belief that evil spirits

can produce storms and hail and thunder; and when some pretended *witches* were arraigned before him, he caused them to be whipped, till they confessed that they deceived the people, in order to gain a livelihood. His works were first published by Masson, Paris, 1605, 8vo; and then, much better, together with those of Leidrad his predecessor, and Amulo his successor, by Stephen Baluze, Paris, 1666, 2 vols. 8vo. *Tr.*]

² *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 607 [and Cave, *Hist. Litt. t. ii.*—Hilduin was made abbot of St. Denys, about 814, and of St. Germain, near Paris, in 816, also arch-chaplain of the palace. After being in great favour with Lewis the Meek, he joined the rebellion of his sons, and was deprived of his offices, and banished to Corbey in Saxony, A.D. 830. But soon after he was restored to his Parisian abbacies. Lewis now directed him to write a full history of St. Dionysius, the founder of his monastery, and the reputed first bishop of Paris. This Hilduin executed in his famous *Areopagitica*. He there makes Dionysius the Areopagite, mentioned Acts xvii. 34, after being bishop of Athens, to have travelled to Rome, thence to Arles, and at last to Paris, where he founded the monastery of St. Denys (Dionysius), converted vast numbers, was bishop of that region, and at length suffered martyrdom, in the reign of Domitian. To him, also, he ascribes all the works that go under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. This is his famous *Areopagitica*, a mere bundle of idle tales, once indeed generally believed, but now universally rejected. *Tr.*]

³ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 550; and his *Life of Charles* the Great, as published by Herm. Schmincke. [See above, cent. viii. pt. ii. c. 2, § 18, note. *Tr.*]

⁴ See Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclés. de M. du Pin*, i. 284. [Claudius was a native of Spain, and educated under Felix of Urgel. In 812 or 813, he became a presbyter in the court of Lewis the Meek, and commenced writing commentaries. In 821, Lewis made him bishop of Turin. He immediately set himself against all image-worship, and even removed and destroyed the pictures and images throughout his diocese. This excited strong oppo-

Freculphus of Lisieux, whose *Chronicon* is still extant, compiled almost entirely in the very words of the ancient writers.¹ *Servatus Lupus*, whose Epistles and tracts are still extant, ranks among the most agreeable writers of those times; nor does he want either acuteness of mind or elegance and extent of learning.² *Drepanius Florus*, called also *Florus Mugister*, has left us Poems, Expositions of some books of Scripture, and a few other writings.³ *Christian Druthmar* expounded the Gospel of St. Matthew.⁴ *Godeschalcus*, a monk of Orbais, is rendered immortal by the controversies respecting divine grace and predestination, to which he gave rise.⁵ *Paschasius Radbert*,

sition, and involved him in controversy all his life. Yet he persevered, denounced image-worship as idolatry, denied that the cross was to be honoured, disapproved of pilgrimages, questioned the supremacy of the pope, &c. Hence some have considered him as a great reformer, and as the founder of the sect of the Waldenses. He certainly opposed some of the superstitions of the age; and probably contributed to preserve more independence of the pope, and greater purity of doctrine and worship in the Alpine countries, than in most other parts of Europe. The catholics have never been partial to him. Indeed, they taxed him with great errors. Yet he was never arraigned as a heretic; nor removed from his bishopric till his death, about 839. His commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, is in the *Biblioth. Patr.* xiv. 134. [That on the books of Kings was published at Bologna, in 1755. *Ed.*] His other commentaries, though not inferior perhaps to those of Rabanus, still lie in MS. Probably, they are unfavourable to popery: for it appears that he maintained the original parity of bishops and presbyters. He wrote on Genesis three books; on Exodus four books; on Leviticus; on the Gospel of Matthew; on the other epistles of Paul; a short scripture Chronology; and tracts on the worship of images and saints, which are lost, except large fragments quoted by his antagonists. See Cave, *Hist. Litteraria*; Fleury, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, liv. xlvii. cap. 20, 21. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxiii. 281, 407, &c. and Milner's *Church Hist.* cent. ix. ch. iii. *Tr.*]

¹ [Freculphus was a Benedictine monk of Fulda, and was made bishop before 824. Lewis the Meek sent him as an envoy to the pope in 824. He was present in various councils, A.D. 829, 835, 837, 846, and 849; and died about 850. His *Chronicon* is in twelve books; the seven first extend from the creation to the Christian era; the other five reach to 606. The work was published, Cologne, 1539, fol. Heidelb. 1597, 8vo, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* xiv. 1061. *Tr.*]

² *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 255. [Lupus surnamed Servatus, was a French Benedictine of [Ferrières]. From about A.D. 828,

he spent eight years at Fulda, under Rabanus; then some time at Seligenstadt, with Eginhard. He next went to court, and in 842 was made abbot of [Ferrières]. He was in several councils, and once envoy to Rome. His death was after 861. He wrote *Liber de Tribus Questionibus*, sc. free-will, predestination, and the superabundance of Christ's merits; also a *Collectaneum*, on the same subjects; the life of St. Wigbert; the life of St. Maximin of Treves; and 130 Epistles; all well edited by S. Baluze, Paris, 1664, 8vo, and then in the *Biblioth. Patr.* xiv. 1. *Tr.*]

³ Colonia, *Hist. Litt. de Lyon*, ii. 135. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 213, &c. [Florus was a deacon at Lyons, and flourished about 837; yet he was a writer as late as 852. His commentaries on all the epistles of Paul are printed as the work of Bede. They are a compilation from Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, and about nine other fathers. He also wrote on the canon of the mass; on using compulsion with the Jews; on the election and duties of a bishop; a commentary on the Psalms; three books on predestination, against John Scotus; nine poetic paraphrases of some Psalms, Hymns, and Epistles; and five other poems. Some of these are published, in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. viii. and xv. Mabillon, *Analect.* t. iv. D'Achery, *Spicileg.* t. xii. Mauguin, *Vindiciæ Gratia*, &c. t. i. &c.—[Mai, *Scr. Vet. Nova Collectio*, t. iii. p. 2. *Ed.*—The rest were never printed. *Tr.*]

⁴ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 84. [Druthmar was a French Benedictine monk of Corbie, and flourished about 840. His commentary on Matthew is so opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation, that the friends of that doctrine have laboured hard to prove the work corrupted by the Lutherans; but in vain, for it was first published before Luther began to assail popery, namely, in the year 1514, as is shown by Edm. Albertin. It is now in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, xv. 86. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* t. ii. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Godeschalcus, or Gotteschalcus, was of Saxon origin, and educated in the monastery of Fulda. When arrived at manhood, he

a man of fame in the controversies respecting the Lord's supper, has left us, besides other works, a book on that subject, which afforded matter for a long debate in that age.¹ *Bertram*, or *Ratramn*, a monk of Corbie, was the principal antagonist of Radbert. His tract on the Lord's supper, drawn up by order of *Charles the Bald*, has occasioned likewise much debate among the learned.² *Haymo* of Halberstadt wrote books of various sorts, which are specimens rather of industry than of genius and learning.³ *Walafriid Strabo* deserved well of the church in that age, by his Poems, his Lives of Saints, and

wished no longer to lead a monastic life; but was compelled to it, on the ground that his father had devoted him to such a life in his childhood, and that no human power could annul the transaction. He now removed to Orbais, was ordained a presbyter, and was so distinguished as a scholar, that he was surnamed *Fulgentius*. Upon some disaffection between him and the bishop of the diocese, he travelled to Italy, and thence to Dalmatia and Pannonia. Augustine was his favourite author; and he now began to advance the opinions of Augustine respecting divine grace, and a two-fold predestination. Many favoured these views; but more were opposed to them. The synod of Mentz, A.D. 847, condemned his sentiments; and the president, *Rabanus Maurus*, sent him to *Hinemar*, archbishop of Rheims, to whose diocese he belonged. The next year he was arraigned before the synod of Kiersy, condemned, degraded, and shut up by *Hinemar* in the monastery of Hauteville; and after twenty-one years' confinement, died in prison. He persevered to the last in his opinions, and was denied Christian burial. He wrote two statements of his faith, a longer and a shorter, both of which are extant. In one of them he offered to be cast into boiling water or oil, and to stake the truth of his doctrine on the issue. He also wrote a letter or two, and a tract on predestination; but they are lost. See *Cave's Hist. Litt. Manguin, Vindiciæ Prædestinationis et Gratiæ*, ii. 45, &c. *L. Cellot, Historia Gotteschalci Prædestinationi*; *Schroëckh, Kirchengesch.* xxiv. 5, &c. *J. Milner, Church Hist.* cent. ix. ch. iv. *Tr.*]

¹ [*Paschasius Radbert* was a French monk, born about 786. In 844 he became abbot of Corbie in France. He was a member of the synod of Kiersy, which condemned *Godeschalcus*, 849, and died April 26, 851. The Protestants regard him as the man who introduced the doctrine of transubstantiation into the Romish church. *Berengarius* taxed him with this; and even *Bellarmin (de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* p. 288) says, *Hic auctor primus fuit, qui serio et copiose scripsit de veritate corporis et sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia*. But *Mabillon (Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* t. vi. præf. p. ix. &c.) endeavours

to confute this charge. He wrote expositions of *Matthew*, of the book of *Lamentations*, of the 44th Psalm; *de Sacramento Corporis et Sanguinis D.N. Jesu, ad Placidum Liber*; *de Corpore et Sang. Domini, ad Frudegardum Epistola*; the life of *St. Adelhard*; the passion of *SS. Rufinus and Valerius*; all which were published by *Sirmond*, Paris, 1618, fol. He also wrote the life of *St. Wala*; and *de Partu Virginis*, libri ii. See *Cave, Hist. Litt.* t. ii. and *Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* vi. 126—142. *Tr.*]

² Concerning both *Radbert* and *Ratramn*, see the *Hist. Littér. de la France*, v. 287 and 332. [*Bertram*, or *Ratramn*, was a French monk of old Corbie, and afterwards abbot of Orbais. He flourished as early as 840, and was still alive in 870. He was a devout, modest, and learned man; and wrote *de Partu Virginis*, proving that the Saviour was born in the ordinary manner, which *Radbert* answered, maintaining the perpetual virginity of *Mary*; *de Prædestinatione*, libri ii. in vindication of the sentiments of *Godeschalcus*; *contra Græcorum Errores*, libri iv.; *de Corpore et Sang. Domini*, in opposition to *Radbert*; and *de Anima Liber. Tr.*—His name seems really to have been *Ratramn*, and to have been corrupted into *Bertram* by joining on to it *Be*, a contraction for *Beatus*. His tract, *de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, was first printed at either Cologne or Bâle, in 1532. It gave an irretrievable shock to the belief in transubstantiation, and has been represented as a forgery of *Æcolampadius*. This view has, however, long been given up as utterly untenable, and some Romanists have endeavoured to explain the piece in such a manner as rather to make it appear unskillfully penned, than subversive of their capital tenet. It has been frequently reprinted and translated. *S.*]

³ Of the works commonly ascribed to *Haymo*, a considerable part are not his, but the productions of *Remigius of Auxerre*. See *Casimir Oudin, Comment. de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* ii. 330. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 111, vi. 106. *Le Beuf, Recueil des Diss. sur l'Histoire de la France*, i. 278. [*Haymo*, or *Aymo*, was a disciple of *Alcuin*, an inti-

his Exposition of difficult passages of Scripture.¹ *Hincmar* of Rheims deserves a very honourable place among the Latin writers of this century. For his writings on various subjects show, that his mind was not of the ordinary class, but elevated, independent, and zealous for truth. But he at the same time was arrogant and of a restless temper. His works throw much light on both the civil and the ecclesiastical history of that age.² *John Erigena Scotus*, the friend and companion of the emperor *Charles* the Bald, combined the study of philosophy with that of theology, and acquired great reputation and fame by the acuteness of his mind, and by his translations from Greek into Latin, as well as by his original compositions.³

mate friend and fellow-student of *Rabanus Maurus*, a monk of Fulda, abbot of Hersfeld, 839, and bishop of Halberstadt, 841. He was at the synod of Mentz in 848, and died 853. Among the writings ascribed to him, are Commentaries on the Psalms, on Isaiah, on the epistles of Paul, on the Apocalypse; all of which are mere compilations from the fathers; *Historiæ Eccles. Breviarium, sive de Christianorum Rerum Memoria*, libri x. a mere abridgment of *Rufinus*; some Homilies; *de Amore Patriæ Cælestis*, libri iii.; and *de Corpore et Sanguine Domini Tractatus*. See *Cave, Hist. Litt. t. ii.* and *Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. v. 585, &c. Tr.]*

¹ See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 59. [*Walafrid Strabo* (or *Strabus*, i.e. *squint-eyed*), was a Suabian; studied in the monastery of Reichenau, then at Fulda under *Rabanus*; became head of the school, and at last abbot of Reichenau, A.D. 842. His death is placed in 849. He was a learned and a pleasing writer; yet bathed in monkish superstition. He wrote *de Officiis divinis sive de Exordiis et Incrementis Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Liber*: *Lives of St. Gall, St. Otho, St. Blaithmaic, St. Mammias, St. Leudegar*; and the vision of *St. Wettin*; various poems; a Tract on the destruction of Jerusalem; and the *Glossa Ordinaria Interlinearis in S. Scripturam*; which is extracted chiefly from the writings of *Rabanus Maurus*. *Tr.]*

² *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 544. [*Hincmar* was a Frenchman, of noble birth, educated under *Hilduin*, in the monastery of *St. Denys* near Paris. He was distinguished as a scholar and a theologian, and in great favour at court. In 830 he had leave to accompany *Hilduin* in his banishment to Saxony. In 845 he was made archbishop of Rheims, in which office he continued till his death, A.D. 882. Possessing talents of the first order, and great activity and perseverance, his influence at court, and in all the ecclesiastical transactions of that part of his country, was immense. Against Augustinianism, and in favour of the liberties

of the Gallican church, he was equally strenuous. Yet he was not free from superstition, as appears from his justification of a trial by ordeal (*Opp. ii. 676*), and his belief in purgatory and visions (*Ibid. p. 805*). Most of his writings are still extant, edited by *Sirmond*, Paris, 1645, 2 vols. fol. They consist of letters on important subjects and events; *Capitula*, or ecclesiastical rules; confutations of *Gotteschalcs*, &c. See *Cave, Hist. Litt. t. ii. Schroeckh, Kirchengesch. xxiv. 20, &c. Tr.]*

³ See *Herm. Conringius, Antiquitates Academicæ*, p. 308. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 416, &c. and others. [*John Scotus Erigena* was a native either of Scotland or Ireland, and a very profound scholar. He passed most of his life in France, and at the court of *Charles* the Bald. About the year 850, he wrote his tract *de Prædestinatione Dei, contra Gotteschalcum*, in nineteen chapters. Being well acquainted with Greek, he acquired the subtlety of an Aristotelian, and the propensity to mysticism of a Platonist. His great work he entitled *περὶ φυσικῶν μυστηρίων, de Divisione Naturæ, seu de Rerum Naturis*, libri v. ed. Oxon. 1681, fol. He translated the works of the *Pseudo-Dionysius Areop.* and the *Scholia* of *St. Maximus* on difficult passages of *Gregory Naz.*, and composed a tract on the Lord's Supper, which is lost, but in which he is said to have denied the doctrine of transubstantiation. Several writers confound him with *John*, a Saxon monk, whom king *Alfred* invited over from France to England, and made abbot of *Athelney*, and who was murdered by the envious monks. But *Mabillon (Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. sæc. iv. part 2, p. 514. Ed. Ven.)* shows, that he was a different person; and that there is no evidence of his going to England in the days of *Alfred*. He was alive A.D. 872. *Tr.*—*Mabillon*, in his *Annales Benedictini*, Lut. Par. 1706, iii. 243, thus sums up the evidence against the identity of *Erigena* with *John*, *Alfred's* friend. *Erigena* is called *Scottigena* by *Hincmar* and *Anastasius*, that is, a Scot by extraction, and born among the Scots, 'id

Remigius,¹ Bertharius,² Ado,³ Aimoin,⁴ Heric,⁵ Regino of Prüm,⁶

est, Scottum genere, ut Nicolaus papa primus diserte explicat, et apud Scottos genitus;’ he never calls himself priest or monk, in the prefaces of his books, nor is so called by his contemporaries; he reached the pontificate of John VIII. (872), but appears not to have outlived it (Dec. 882): he was a mere sophist, ‘nonnisi sophisticam artem caluerit,’ he seems to have written nothing later than some verses which must be dated before the end of 875. Whereas John, Alfred’s friend, was both priest and monk: was *from the old Saxon stock, that is, took his origin from Old Saxony*. ‘Eald Sax-onum genere, id est, e veteri Saxonia ori-undum,’ therefore, was a German Saxon; yet alive in 895, being then killed yet in his strength; and was not inept in the warlike art. Of these reasons, Mabillon considers the place of Erigena’s birth quite conclusive against his identity with Alfred’s friend, the one being undoubtedly a native of either Ireland or Scotland, the other of continental Saxony. ‘Hac vel una ratione omnino distinguendus est hic Johannes a Johanne Scotto.’ But although Old Saxony undoubtedly means the former continental home of the Saxons, Asser’s words do not necessarily imply that Alfred’s friend John was born there, only that his family came from that country, which it might well do, and live notwithstanding, when he was born, either in Scotland or Ireland. The omission of his description as a *priest and monk*, in some contemporary books, and in his own, is not conclusive. He might have been neither, when first known to the world, but both subsequently; or the omission might have been merely accidental. Nor is the argument from dates conclusive. He appears to have come into France in the early part of Charles the Bald’s reign, which began in 840, and he is thought to have lived until 895, having been strong enough to struggle, some time before, with two assassins. He might, however, have gone to France a mere lad, some time after 840, and been quite able to struggle for his life nearly, or quite, fifty years afterwards. Mabillon’s reasons, therefore, though carrying considerable weight, are not sufficient to prove that Malmesbury and Hoveden were mistaken in calling Alfred’s friend *John Scot*, and that Spelman, Abp. Ussher, Fuller, Collier, and other moderns were to blame for following them. Undoubtedly, these latter were anxious to make out a case against transubstantiation, of which doctrine John Scot was an early opponent. If, therefore, Alfred was his patron, he too must be numbered among opponents of that doctrine. On the other hand, Mabillon, with others, was

anxious to make out a case in favour of transubstantiation. Each side, consequently, has its own bias, and it need not be supposed that Mabillon has completely overthrown the opinion, that, until his time, generally prevailed. In fact, he ultimately pronounced it *not clear* whether John Scot might not have gone to Alfred *uninvited* after the death of Charles the Bald. ‘An vero Johannes Scotus ad Ælfredum, quem literarum amantem noverat, mortuo Carolo Calvo, ultro ipse accesserit, mihi non liquet.’ *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* iv. pars 2, p. 519. Only Mabillon will not admit that Erigena could be the John sent for by Alfred from Gaul. This is, however, for polemical purposes, immaterial, the whole dispute being raised upon the possibility of Alfred’s patronage to a strong opponent of transubstantiation. Trithemius makes John Scot and Erigena two different persons. Alfred’s John and Erigena are also distinguished by some of the moderns. But Oudin contends for their identity, and with arguments that are a thorough match for Mabillon’s on the other side. *De Scriptor. Eccl.* ii. 241. S.—The weight of testimony is overwhelmingly against the identity. *Ed.*

¹ [There were two eminent men in this century, of the name of Remigius. The one, bishop of Lyons, and active from 850 to 875, in several councils, in behalf of Augustinianism and Godeschalcius. He wrote *De tribus Episcoporum Epistolis Liber, seu Responso Ecclesie Lugdunensis nomine facta adversus Hincmarum, Rabani, et anonymi Episcopi Epistolas* (in defence of Augustinianism); *Libellus de tenenda Scripturæ veritate, et SS. Patrum auctoritate sectanda*; and *Absolutio questionis de generali per Adamum damnatione, et speciali per Christum ex eadem crepione electorum*. These tracts are in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, t. xv.; and in Mauguin, *Collectio Scriptor. de Prædestinatione*, &c. t. i.—The other Remigius was a Benedictine monk of St. Germain’s of Auxerre, and hence called Autissiodorensis. In the year 882, or subsequently, he was called to Rheims to take charge of the bishop’s school. He died about A.D. 900. His works are Commentaries on all the Psalms of David; on the eleven last minor prophets; on the Epistles of St. Paul (sometimes ascribed, though falsely, to Haymo of Halberstadt); and an exposition of the mass. All these are compilations from the fathers. *Tr.*]

² [St. Bertharius was of noble French origin, and first a monk, and then abbot of Monte Cassino in Italy, from 856, till his death in 884. The Saracens frequently plundered that monastery, and at last slew Bertharius at the altar. See Mabillon, *Acta*

and others, are here passed over, as a sufficient knowledge of them may easily be obtained from common writers.¹

Sanctor. Ord. Bened. vi. 472, &c. He wrote several discourses, poems, and lives or eulogies of saints; most of which remain unpublished in the archives of his monastery. *Tr.*

³ [Ado, a French monk, born about A.D. 800, made archbishop of Vienne A.D. 860, and died A.D. 876. He was much esteemed, and active in several councils, in favour of Augustinianism. He wrote a *Martyrology* before he was a bishop, and afterwards, a brief chronology, from the creation to about A.D. 870; also the lives of some saints. See Mabillon, l. c. vi. 278—290. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Aimoin, a Benedictine monk of St. Germain, at Paris, near the close of this century. He wrote the history of the miracles and of the removal of the relics of St. Germain and St. George; which is extant in Mabillon, l. c. iv. 96, &c.; and vi. 45, &c. This Aimoin must not be confounded with Aimoin the Benedictine monk of Fleury, in the eleventh century, the author of the *Historia de Rebus gestis Francorum*. See Labbé, *de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. ad Bellarminum*, p. 305, &c. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Hericus or Erricus, born at Hery, a village near Auxerre, and a Benedictine monk at Auxerre, near the close of this century. He wrote six books of poetry, on the life of St. Germain; and two books of prose, respecting his miracles; besides numerous Homilies, some of which are now inserted in the *Homiliarium* of Paul Diaconus. See Cave, *Hist. Littér.* t. ii. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Regino was a German, a monk of Prüm, in the diocese of Treves, chosen abbot there A.D. 892; opposed, and induced to resign A.D. 899. He died A.D. 908. His *Chronicon*, from the Christian era to 907, and continued by another hand to 972, relates chiefly to the Franks and Teutons. It is printed among the *Scriptores Rerum German.* ed. of Pistorius, t. i. His two books, *de Disciplinis Ecclesiasticis et Religione Christiana*, (a collection from councils, and the fathers, relating to ecclesiastical law,) are best edited by Steph. Baluze, Paris, 1671, 8vo. *Tr.*]

¹ [The *Latin writers* omitted by Mosheim are the following:—

Benedictus Anianensis, born in Lower Languedoc, A.D. 751; educated at court, and for some years employed in civil life. In the year 774 he retired to a monastery; and six years after, to avoid being made abbot, withdrew to a cell near the river Aniane, where monks gathered around him, and he became abbot of that, and a dozen other monasteries propagated from it. He died A.D. 814. See his life, written by

Ardo, his disciple, in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* v. 183—215. He wrote *Codex Regularum Monasticar.* (a collection of the rules of most orders of monks previous to his time); edited by L. Holstenius, 1661, and Paris, 1664, 4to.—*Concordia Regularum*; a collection of exhortations to monks; *Modus diversarum Penitentiarum*; and some epistles.

Ludger, a monk of Utrecht, who spent some time in England, and travelled in Italy, became abbot of Werden, and bishop of Munster, 802, and died 809. See his life, written by Altfred, the second bishop after him, in Mabillon, l. c. v. 14—33. He wrote the life of St. Gregory, bishop of Utrecht, and some letters, still extant.

Smaragdus, abbot of St. Michael, in the diocese of Verdun; flourished about 810, and wrote commentaries on the Lessons from the Gospels and Epistles; *Diadema Monachorum*; a commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict; *Via Regia*; a letter for Charles the Great to the pope; Acts of a conference at Rome, A.D. 810; and a grammatical commentary on Donatus, in fourteen books.

Amalarius, a deacon, and perhaps rural bishop of Metz. He flourished from 812 to 836; and wrote *de Divinis sive Ecclesiasticis Officiis Libri* iv. (both in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, t. xiv.); also some epistles, *Ecloga in Canonem Missæ*, and *Regula seu Institutio Canonicorum*.

Hatto, abbot of Reichenau, and bishop of Bâle, A.D. 811—836. He wrote some capitula for his diocese, and an account of the visions of Wettin, Hildegard, and other monkish saints.

Hettius or Hetto, archbishop of Treves, A.D. 814, &c. has left us two Epistles.

Frotharius, abbot of St. Aper, and bishop of Toul, A.D. 817—837. He wrote *Epistolarum Liber*, addressed to various bishops; published by Duchesne, among the *Scriptores Rerum Francicarum*, ii. 719.

Ekbo or Ebo, a German, educated at the imperial court, employed some time in civil affairs, then abbot of St. Remi, and A.D. 816 archbishop of Rheims. In 822, he went to Rome, and obtained a commission to convert the northern nations; in consequence of which he made two journeys to Denmark. In 833 he joined the revolt of Lothair against his father Lewis; for which he lost his bishopric, and was kept in custody at Fulda and other places. In 840 he was restored to his see, but lost it the next year. In 844 he was made bishop of Hildesheim; and died A.D. 851. Of this restless prelate, we have nothing remaining but his *Apolo-*

geticus, presented to the council of Hildesheim; and published in the *Concilia*.

Halitgarius, bishop of Cambray and Arras, A.D. 816. He accompanied Ebbo in one of his excursions to Denmark. In 828 the emperor Lewis sent him as envoy to Constantinople. He returned the next year with abundance of relics; and died in 831. He wrote *Opus de Vitiis et Virtutibus, Remediis Peccatorum, et Ordine et Judiciis Penitentiae, sex Libris absolutum*; published by H. Canisius, and in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, xiv. 906.

Paschal II., pope A.D. 817—824, has left us several Epistles; which are in the *Concilia*. [Jaffé, 222. *Ed.*]

Sedulius, a Scot, who flourished about 818, and compiled from the fathers a *Collectaneum, seu Explanatio in Epistolas S. Pauli*; which is extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, vi. 494. He is to be distinguished from Sedulius the poet. See Labbé, *de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. apud Bellarminum, de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* p. 149—152.

Dungal, a monk of St. Denys, near Paris, A.D. 821. He wrote a confutation of Claudius of Turin, in vindication of image-worship; which is in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, xiv. 196, and a letter to Charles the Great, *de Eclipsi Solari*.

Jonas, bishop of Orleans, A.D. 821—843. He was much employed on councils; and wrote three books against Claudius of Turin, in favour of retaining images, but without worshipping them; also *de Institutione Laicorum*, libri iii. and *de Institutione Regia Liber*; extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, xiv. 166.

Eugenius II., pope, A.D. 824—827, has left us two Epistles, and nine Decreta; which are extant in the *Concilia*. [Jaffé, 224. *Ed.*]

Gregory IV. pope, A.D. 828—844. Three of his Epistles are in the Collections of Councils; and another, concerning the monastery of Fleury, in *Baluzii Miscel.* ii. 145. [Jaffé, 226. *Ed.*]

Ansegisus, abbot of various monasteries in France, from 807, till his death in 833. He collected the *Capitularia Caroli Magni de Rebus præsertim Ecclesiasticis*, in four books; best edited by Steph. Baluze, Paris, 1677, 2 tom. fol. His life, written by a contemporary, is in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* v. 593, &c.

Ardo, called Smaragdus, abbot of Aniane, and author of the life of his predecessor Benedict of Aniane; which is in Mabillon, l. c. v. 183, &c. Several other works have been ascribed to him, but some adjudge them to another of the same name.

Theganus, a learned French gentleman, and suffragan to the archbishop of Treves. He flourished about 837; and wrote *Annales de gestis Ludovici Imp. ab ann. 813 usque*

ad ann. 837; extant among the *Scriptores Rerum Francicar.* ed. Duchesne, t. ii.

Amulo, Amulus, or Amularius, archbishop of Lyons, A.D. 841—852, or longer. He wrote *Epistola ad Theobaldum*, exploding certain relics and the vendors of them: *ad Godeschalcum Epistola*, disapproving his opinions: and three tracts, on free-will, predestination, and grace: all which were published by S. Baluze, subjoined to the works of Agobard, and in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, xiv. 329.

Nithardus, grandson of Charles the Great; first a courtier and soldier, and then a monk. He flourished A.D. 843, and died in 853. He has left us four books, *de Dissidio filiorum Ludovici Pii*, from 814—843; published by Pithæus, and by Duchesne, *Rerum Francicarum Scriptores*, ii. 259.

Sergius II. pope, A.D. 844—847, has left two Epistles. [Jaffé, 229. *Ed.*]

Prudens or Prudentius, a Spaniard, but bishop of Troyes in France. He flourished A.D. 846, and died in 861. He wrote several tracts on predestination, &c., against John Scotus, Hincmar, &c., which are extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, xv. 598; and also in Manguin *Vindiciæ Gratiæ*, t. ii.

Pardulus, bishop of Laon, A.D. 847—856. His Epistle to Hincmar of Rheims, is printed *inter Opera Hincmari*, tom. ii. p. 838.

Eulogius of Cordova, flourished from 847 to 859, when he was beheaded by the Saracens, for his opposition to their laws. He wrote *Memoriale Sanctorum, sive Libri iii. de Martyribus Cordubensibus; Apologeticus pro Martyribus; Exhortatio ad Martyrium*; and several Epistles; all extant *inter Rerum Hispanicarum Scriptores*, t. iv.; and in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, xv. 242.

Alvarus, a Spanish Christian of Cordova, the intimate friend of Eulogius. He wrote the life of Eulogius, several epistles, and a tract entitled *Scintille Patrum*; all of which, except the last, are published with the works of Eulogius.

Leo IV. pope, A.D. 847—855, has left us sixteen epistles, and fragments of several others; besides a good homily, addressed to presbyters and deacons on the pastoral duties; extant in the *Councils*, &c. [Jaffé, 230. *Ed.*]

Wendelbert, a Benedictine monk of Prüm, who flourished A.D. 850. He wrote the life and miracles of St. Goar (in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* ii. 269, &c.); also a martyrology, in heroic verse, published among the works of Bede, t. i. under the title of *Ephemerides Bedæ*.

Æneas, bishop of Paris, A.D. 854—869. He wrote *Adversus Objectiones Græcorum Liber*; published by D'Achery, *Spicileg.* t. vii. and a short epistle to Hincmar.

Benedict III. pope, A.D. 855—858. Five or six of his epistles are in the *Concilia*, &c. [Jaffé, 235. *Ed.*]

Herard, archbishop of Tours, A.D. 855—871, has left us 140 *Capitula*, addressed to his clergy, and some other papers, in the *Concilia*.

Hincmar, bishop of Laon, A.D. 856—871, when he was deposed. This proud and tyrannical prelate quarrelled with his uncle, Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, with the king, with his clergy, and others; appealed to Rome, and obtained support from the pope; but was finally put down. He died about 881. There remain of him several epistles, and documents relating to his contests: extant in the works of Hincmar of Rheims, and in the *Concilia*.

Angelomus, a Benedictine monk of Luxeuil in Burgundy, who flourished A.D. 856. He wrote *Stromata*, or Commentaries on the four books of Kings; and also on the Canticles; which are extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, xv. 307.

Nicolas, pope, A.D. 858—867. He began the controversy with Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, and opposed king Lothair's divorce of his queen. He has left us about 100 epistles; a reply to the interrogatories of the Bulgarians in 106 *Capitula*, besides decrees and rescripts on various subjects. His letters were published at Rome, 1542, fol. and with his other works are now in the *Councils*, &c. [Jaffé, 237. *Ed.*]

Isaac, bishop of Langres, A.D. 859—878, or longer. He, or Isaac, abbot of Poitiers, wrote a long epistle, *de Canone Missæ*; published by D'Achery, *Spicileg.* t. xiii. He is the author of a *Collectio Canonum*, like the Greek Nomo-canon, compiled from the *Capitula* of the French kings, and the decisions of councils; which was published by Sirmond, and since in other Collections of councils.

Hulderic, Udalric, or Ulric, bishop of Augsburg, A.D. 860—900. He was a distinguished prelate, and wrote a long letter to pope Nicolas, reproaching his rigid enforcement of celibacy upon the clergy. This famous letter, which pope Gregory VII. condemned as heretical, A.D. 1079, has been often printed by the Protestants.

Hadrian, or Adrian, pope, A.D. 867—872. He continued the contest with Photius, and assumed great power in France. Forty of his epistles, besides some addresses and papers, are extant in the *Councils*, &c. [Jaffé, 254. *Ed.*]

Anastasius Bibliothecarius, an abbot, presbyter and librarian at Rome, who was papal envoy to Constantinople, to Naples, &c. He was one of the most learned men of his time (A.D. 870—886), and well acquainted with the Greek language. He wrote *Acta Concilii Constantinop. IV.* in

Latin, falsely called the eighth general Council, A.D. 869; *Acta Concilii Nicæni II.* A.D. 787, Latine versa; *Historia Ecclesiastica*, sive *Chronographia Tripartita*, compiled from Niceph. Patr. of Cpl., George Syncell. and Theophanes Confessor; *Historia de vitis Romanorum Pontificum, seu Liber Pontificalis*, from St. Peter to pope Nicolas I. *Collectanea de iis, quæ spectant ad Historiam Monothelitarum*; besides various letters and tracts, either original, or translations and abstracts; published by Sirmond, Paris, 1620, 8vo. His Acts of councils, and his lives of the popes, are inserted in the Collections of Councils. [The Lives of the Popes, more usually called the *Pontifical Book*, was not written by Anastasius, but is universally admitted to be a spurious production from two or more unknown pens. Oudin. ii. 267. S.]

John VIII., pope, A.D. 872—882. He was an active pope, but greatly harassed by the Saracens, who infested all southern Italy. There are extant, in the Collections of Councils, and elsewhere, 326 of his epistles. [Jaffé, 260. *Ed.*]

Hartmutus, or Hartmannus, abbot of St. Gall, A.D. 872—883. He wrote some poems and hymns, published by Canisius, *Lectiones Antiq.* t. v. also the life of St. Wiborada, a virgin martyr; extant in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* vii. 42, &c.

John, a deacon at Rome, and the friend of Anastasius Biblioth. who flourished A.D. 875. He wrote the life of St. Gregory the Great, in four books; which is in all the editions of the works of Gregory; and in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* i. 389, &c.

Usuardus, a French monk of St. Germain's, at Paris, who flourished A.D. 876. Displeased with the brevity of the martyrologies of Jerome and Bede, he wrote one more full and particular, under the countenance of Charles the Bald. It was published, Louvain, 1568, 8vo; and with omissions of what displeased the Papists, at Antwerp, 1587, 8vo.

Abbo, a monk of St. Germain, having witnessed the siege of Paris by the Normans, in the year 887, composed a history of it, in three books of very uncouth verses; published among the *Scriptores Historie Franc.*

Stephen VI., pope, A.D. 885—891, has left us [28 Epistles and fragments. Jaffé, 294. *Ed.*]

Wolfhardus, a Benedictine monk and presbyter in the diocese of Eichstadt, who flourished A.D. 886, has left us a life of St. Walburga, or St. Walpurgis, in four books; extant in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* iv. 260, &c.

Herembertus, or Erchembertus, a monk of Monte Cassino, A.D. 887. He wrote a

Chronicon, or a full History of the Lombards, continued to 888; an abridgment of which, made up (it is supposed) by the author himself, was published at Naples, 1626, 4to, together with three other Chronicles.

Adrevaldus, or Adalbertus, a Benedictine of Fleury, A.D. 890; wrote the history of the Translation of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica from Monte Cassino to Fleury; extant in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* ii. 338, &c. He also wrote *de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, in opposition to the views of John Scotus; extant in D'Achery, *Spicileg.* t. xii.

Asserius, a British priest, much employed by Alfred the Great, and by him made bishop of Sherborne. He flourished A.D. 890, and wrote a history of the life and achievements of king Alfred; which is published among the *Scriptores Rerum Anglicarum*, ed. Francf. 1602, p. 1, &c. [Asser was first published together with Walsingham, by Abp. Parker, in 1574. In 1722 it was published separately by Wise, at Oxford. S.]

Gulielmus, librarian of the church of Rome, A.D. 890. He continued Anastasius' lives of the popes, from 867 to 891.

Solomon, a German monk, abbot, and at last bishop of Constance, A.D. 890—920. He left several poems; published in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. xvi.

Formosus, pope, A.D. 891—896. He had sharp contests with the citizens of Rome; and when dead, his successor, Stephen VII., dug up his remains, deposed him, mutilated his body, and cast it into the Tiber. Several of his Epistles are extant in the Councils. [Jaffé, 298. *Ed.*]

Auxilius, a writer little known, who flourished about A.D. 894, and composed a history of pope Formosus, and the contests respecting him, in two books; in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, xvii. 1.

The popes, Stephen VII. 896, 897, John IX. 898—900, and Benedict IV. 900—904, have left us:—the first, two Epistles; the next, four; and the third, four: which are in the *Concilia*, &c. *Tr.* [See Jaffé, 302—306. *Ed.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

§ 1. The low state of religion and learning — § 2. Causes of this evil — § 3. The corruption of the age manifest in the worship of saints and relics — § 4. Canonisation of saints — § 5. Biographies of saints — § 6. Attachment to relics — § 7. Regard for the Holy Scriptures — § 8. Faults of the Latin expositors — § 9. The Allegorists — § 10. Method of treating theological subjects — § 11. State of practical theology — § 12. Progress of mysticism — § 13. Polemic theology — § 14, 15. Controversy respecting images, among the Greeks — § 16. Among the Latins — § 17. Iconoclasts among the Latins — § 18. Controversy respecting the procession of the Holy Spirit continued — § 19. Paschasius Radbert's controversy respecting the Lord's Supper — § 20. His opposer, Bertram — § 21. The involved controversy about stercoranism — § 22. Controversy respecting grace and predestination; Godeschalcus — § 23. History of this contest — § 24. Judgment respecting it — § 25. Hinemar and Godeschalcus contend about a three-fold Deity — § 26. Strife respecting the parturition of St. Mary — § 27, 28. First controversy between the Greeks and Latins, respecting Photius — § 29, 30, 31, 32. Their second controversy.

§ 1. So long as those persons survived in the West, whom *Charles* the Great's liberality and zeal for Christianity had prompted to the study of the Bible, and a candid investigation of truth, there were many errors and superstitions which could not find access to the Latins. Not a few proofs, accordingly, have been collected out of the writers of this age, showing that the truth had some strenuous vindicators. But as these men were gradually removed, and barbarism regained its former ascendancy, a flood of superstitious and

pious follies, and of base and degrading opinions, rushed in from all quarters. And none were more zealous and active in the propagation of them than the professed teachers and patrons of piety and religion, who were corrupted, partly by ignorance, partly by love of their own interests. The face of Christianity was not much better among the orientals and Greeks, although sometimes an individual arose, who was anxious to succour the sinking cause of pure religion.

§ 2. The causes of this evil those will readily perceive, who are not ignorant of the things that happened among Christians in this age. The oriental doctors, distracted by intestine broils and foreign controversies, became disqualified for more sober investigations; and as one error generally draws on another, it was the natural consequence of their fierce disputes among themselves upon image-worship, and with the Latins, upon the superiority and divine origin of their discipline and opinions, that many other evils should arise. Moreover, the uncomfortable and irrational mode of life pursued by those who retired to deserts and solitary retreats, was inconsistent with a sound mind and a sober judgment. Yet persons of this class were immensely numerous, and their influence was by no means small. In the West, the incursions of the barbarous tribes, the wars and abominable crimes of the sovereigns, the neglect of every branch of learning, the infatuated purpose of the Roman pontiffs to display and extend their power, and the impostures and falsehoods of the monks, were ruinous to the cause of virtue, of mental cultivation, and piety.

§ 3. To see clearly the heights which ignorance and perversity reached in this age, it is only needful to consider its extravagant, or, more properly, senseless fondness for saints, and for their dead bodies and bones. In this the greatest part of piety and religion was really placed. Everybody believed that God would never be found propitious to those who had not secured some intercessor and friend among the inhabitants of heaven. Hence every separate congregation, and almost every individual person, sought for some particular patron, fearing lest insufficient care should be taken of their own interests by those who were already engaged for other people: their habit, in fact, was to estimate the condition of the blessed by man's way of living and thinking. Hence arose the rage for making, almost daily, new objects of deification. And the priests and monks were most successful in dispelling the darkness that concealed the wondrous deeds of many holy men; or rather, in fabricating the names and the histories of saints that never existed, so that they might have patrons enough for all the credulous and senseless people. Many, however, provided for themselves, by committing their interests and their salvation to phantoms of their own creation, or to delirious persons, whose lives were thought extremely holy, because they had been those of fools and madmen.

§ 4. To this licentiousness of multiplying daily the number of ministers at that celestial court, which ill-informed men pictured to themselves, the ecclesiastical councils endeavoured to set bounds;

for they ordained that no person should be accounted a glorified saint, unless he was declared worthy of that honour by a bishop and provincial council, in presence of the people.¹ This fallacious remedy laid some restraint upon the inconsiderateness of the people. There were also some in this age who deemed it useful and proper, though not absolutely necessary, that the decisions of bishops and councils should be sanctioned and confirmed by the concurrence and authority of him who stood at the head of ecclesiastical affairs, that is, of the Roman bishop. Nor will this excite surprise, if we consider the great increase of the papal power, in this unenlightened, rude, and superstitious age. There is indeed no example extant, older than the tenth century, of any man's formal enrolment among nobles of the heavenly commonwealth by the Roman bishop.² That he was, however, sometimes consulted on such matters, and his opinion asked respecting those to be consecrated, may be shown by various testimonies;³ and it was by such steps as these that he mounted gradually to that power of creating tutelary deities, which is denominated *canonisation*.

§ 5. The number of celestial or glorified saints being so preposterously multiplied, nothing better was to be expected than that their biographies should be written, filled with falsehoods and fables; and that accounts should be published of transactions which no one ever performed. There is yet extant a great mass of such silly tales; most of them undoubtedly produced not long after Charles's age, by idle monks. The same adepts at imposture did not shrink from contaminating with many falsehoods and fictitious prodigies the histories of those who really suffered persecution and death for the cause of Christ, in former times; which presumption does not escape castigation from some of the better contemporary writers.⁴ These falsifi-

¹ Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. sæcul. v. [t. vii.]* Præf. p. xlv. &c. [p. lvii. &c. ed. Venice.] Jo. Launoy, *de Lazari, Magdalene et Marthæ in Provinciam appulsu*, c. i. § xii. Opp. t. ii. pt. i. p. 342. Franc. Pagi, *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* ii. 259, iii. 30.

² See Dan. Papebroch, *de Solennium Canonisationum Initii et Progressu, in Propylæo Actor. SS. mense Maii*, p. 171, &c. [Jo. Mabillon, *ubi supra*; J. F. Buddeus, *de Origine Ἀποθεώσεως, seu Canonisationis, in Eccl. Rom. in his Miscell. Sacr.* p. 463, &c.] and the authors referred to, on this subject, by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliogr. Antiquar. c.* vii. § xxv. p. 270.

³ See the very temperate and ingenuous discussion of this subject, by the sovereign pontiff, Benedict XIV. previously Prosper Lambertini; *de Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Beatorum Canonizatione*, l. i. cap. vii. in his Opp. i. 50, ed. Rom. It were to be wished the historians of the church of Rome would learn to imitate the discretion and fairness of their pontiff. [The earliest

solemn canonisation by the popes, of which we have authentic records, is that of Ulric bishop of Augsburg, by John XV. A.D. 995. Yet bishops, metropolitans, and provincial councils, were concerned in such acts for more than a century after this. And it was not till the pontificate of Alexander III. A.D. 1160—1181, that the popes claimed the exclusive power of adding new saints to the Calendar. See Mabillon, *ubi supra*, p. lix. § 91, and p. lxxviii. § 99, &c. *Tr.*]

⁴ See Servatus Lupus, *Vita Maximini*, p. 275, 276; and the ingenuous and learned remarks on this subject, made in several places by John Launoy; *Dispunctio Epistolæ Petri de Marca, de tempore quo in Gallia Christi fides recepta*, cap. xiv. p. 110. — Dissert. iii. *de primis Christianæ Reliq. in Gallia initiis*. Diss. ii. p. 142, 144, 145, 147, 168, 169, 184. — *de Lazari, Magdal. et Marthæ in Galliam appulsu*, p. 340. — *de duobus Dionysiis*, Opp. t. ii. pt. i. p. 527, 529, 530. See also Martene, *Thesaurus Anecdotor.* i. 151, and the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 273.

cations often flowed from a perverted piety. For this rude and ignorant age supposed men in heaven still to be delighted with praise, and therefore to favour excessively such as publish their services. Others were prompted to this presumptuous conduct by their lust of gain and honour. The populace, it was found, in seasons of perplexity and danger, crowded with presents to the temples of those saints who passed for the more ancient, and for those whose power had been demonstrated by many and great prodigies while they were alive. Wherefore none, whom any religious community had employed in writing the biography of its heroes, could give satisfaction, if they were strictly honest, and would not add fictitious miracles to the true.¹

§ 6. In the bones of those who were accounted saints, and in everything which they had used while alive, nay, even in the very ground which they had touched, there was supposed to reside a marvellous power for repelling all evils, both bodily and mental, and especially of paralysing the machinations of the prince of darkness. Hence, hardly anyone was willing to be without safeguards of this kind. Eagerness for them led some to encounter severe toils, and troublesome, but useless, journeys; others to delude the miserable populace with base impostures. To obtain a sufficiency of relics for those in quest of them, the hidden bodies of saints were first sought by the priests with prayer and fasting, and then were found; God, forsooth, showing the way, and pointing to the spot. Oh, how great the joy when such a treasure came to light! Some travelled into the East, with a view of bringing home, from places rendered famous by the presence of Christ and his friends, those objects which would comfort the faint-hearted, and give a feeling of security to their country itself, and their fellow-citizens. Nor did they come back disappointed; for the cunning Greeks, always versatile and knavish, took from the unsuspecting Latins genuine coin, and sent them off again laden with spurious wares. In this way the numerous holy bodies, and parts of bodies, of *Mark, James, Bartholomew, Cyprian, Pantaleon*, and others, in which the West still exults, were introduced among the Latins. Those who were unable to procure these precious treasures, by either journeys, or prayers, or frauds, deemed it expedient to *steal* them, or to seize them by violence and robbery. For whatever means were used in such a case as this, were considered as pious and acceptable to God, if one only could succeed.²

§ 7. There were few among the Greeks who attempted to explain the sacred volume, except *Photius*; who has left *Questions on the Holy Scriptures*,³ an explanation of St. Paul's epistles, and some

¹ Among all the lives of saints, composed in this age, none are more to be suspected than those written by Britons and Armoricans. See Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* t. i. preface, p. viii.

² Read Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicae Medii Aevi*, v. 6, &c. who presents us with examples.

³ [This work is entitled *Amphilochia*, because it was addressed to Amphilochus, bishop of Cyzicus. Among other large extracts, J. C. Wolf has subjoined one of sixty-five pages to the fourth volume of his *Curæ Philologicae*, ed. 2. Hamb. 1741. He also gives account of the work in his preface to that volume. Most of the questions relate

other things of this nature. He made use of his own reason and ingenuity; and yet he cannot be esteemed a good interpreter. All the other Greeks, who attempted expositions of the Scriptures, merely collected passages from the writers of preceding ages, and attached them to the declarations of the sacred volume. Thus it was in this century, and among the Greeks, that what are called *catenæ*, that is, expositions of Scripture compiled from the writings of the old doctors, of which no small number has come down to us, first began to be drawn up. For most theologians, feeling an incompetence for greater things, thought themselves able to accomplish their object by collecting together the fine thoughts of the ancient fathers.

§ 8. The Latin interpreters were far more numerous; for *Charles* had, in the preceding century, awakened an ardour for the study and exposition of the sacred volume. Among these interpreters, here and there one is not wholly destitute of merit; as, for instance, *Christian Druthmar*, whose Commentary on Matthew has come down to us,¹ and *Bertharius*, to whom are ascribed two books *Ἀντικείμενων*.² But most of them were incompetent to their work; and, like the interpreters of the preceding age, may be divided into two classes, those who trod in the steps of former expositors and collected their opinions, and those who dig mysteries and various recondite meanings, from the plainest texts, generally in a very clumsy manner. At the head of the former class stands *Rabanus Maurus*, who confesses that he drew his expositions of Matthew and of St. Paul's epistles from the writings of the fathers. Of the like character were *Walafrid Strabo*, author of what is called the *Glossa Ordinaria*, and who drew his materials chiefly from *Rabanus*; *Claudius* of Turin, who followed *Augustine* and *Origen*; *Hinemar*,³ whose *Stromata* on the four Books of Kings, compiled from the fathers, are still extant; *Remigius* of Auxerre, who elucidated the Psalms of David and other books of Scripture from the same source; *Sedulius*, who expounded the epistles of St. Paul according to the views of the fathers; *Florus* Magister, who chose *Augustine* for his guide; *Haymo* of Halberstadt; and others.

§ 9. At the head of the latter class, we again find *Rabanus Maurus*, whose very diffuse work on the Allegories of the Scriptures is yet extant. He is followed by *Smaragdus*, *Haymo*, *Scotus*, *Paschasius Radbert*, and many others, whose names it would be needless to mention. The expositors of this class all agree, that besides the literal import, there are other meanings of the sacred

to difficult texts in the Old and New Testaments; but some of them are theological, philosophical, grammatical, historical, and literary. About one-sixth part of the whole is to be found in the Epistles of Photius, published by R. Montague, London, 1651. *Tr.*—They are now all printed by Cardinal Mai, viz., 20 in *Scr. Vet. Nova Collectio*, vol. i. pt. i. p. 193, ed. 1825; 130 in vol. ix. p. 1—158, ed. 1837. *Ed.*]

¹ See Rich. Simon, *Histoire Critique des Principaux Commentat. du N. T.* cap. xxv. p. 348, and *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclès.* par M. Du Pin, i. 293, &c. He treats of most of the other commentators here noticed; *ibid.* cap. xxvi. xxvii.

² [Reconciling difficult texts. *Tr.*]

³ [Of Rheims. *Tr.*]

books; but as to the number of these meanings, they are not agreed. For some of them make *three* senses; others *four* or *five*; and one, who is not the worst Latin interpreter of the age, *Angelome*, a monk of Lisieux, maintains that there are *seven* senses of the sacred books.¹

§ 10. In explaining and supporting the doctrines of religion, the Greeks and Latins were equally neglectful of their duty. Their manner of treating such subjects was dry, and better suited to the memory than to the understanding. The Greeks, for the most part, followed *Damascenus*; the Latins acquiesced in the decisions of *Augustine*. The authority of the ancients was substituted for arguments and proofs; as may be clearly seen by the *Collectaneum de tribus questionibus*, by *Servatus Lupus*, and the Tract of *Remigius* on holding firmly to the truths of Scripture, and adhering faithfully to the authority of the holy and orthodox fathers. Those who appealed to the testimony of the sacred writers, either construed their words in what is called the *allegorical sense*, or deemed it wrong to put any other construction upon them than had been put on them by councils and the fathers. The Irish doctors alone, and among them *John Scotus*, ventured to explain the doctrines of Christianity in a philosophical manner. But they generally incurred strong disapprobation; for the Latin theologians of that age would allow no place for reason and philosophy in matters of religion.²

§ 11. Practical theology was treated negligently and unskilfully by all who attended to it. Some gleaned sentences from the writings of the ancients, relating to piety and the duties of men, as may be seen in the *Scintille Patrum* of *Alvarus*. Others composed treatises on the virtues and vices; as *Hiligerius*, *Rabanus Maurus*, and *Jonas* of Orleans; but it is not easy to discover in them traces of the pattern left us by Christ. Some endeavoured to unfold the will of God, and make it intelligible to the unlearned by a tissue of *allegories*: a method, the faults of which are manifest. The writers of sermons and of treatises on penance, of whom the number was not inconsiderable among the Latins, I pass over in silence. Some of the Greeks began to apply themselves to the solution of what are called *cases of conscience*.³

§ 12. The doctrines of the mystics, which originated from *Dionysius*, falsely called the Areopagite, and which taught men to abstract their minds from all sensible things, and to join them in an inexplicable union with God, had long been in the highest estimation among the Greeks, and especially the monks. And the praises of this *Dionysius* were pompously sung, in this century, by *Michael*

¹ See the Preface to his Commentary on the books of Kings, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, xv. 308. The commentary of Angelome on the book of Genesis, was published by Bernh. Pez, *Thesaurus Anecdotor.* t. i. pt. i. But it would have been no loss to sacred literature, had it remained in obscurity.

² Respecting the dislike of Scotus, see Boulay, *Historia Academ. Paris*, i. 182. Add the life of John of Gortz, in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* Sæcul. v. [t. vii.] p. 392.

³ See Nicephorus Chartophylax, *Epistol.* ii. in the *Biblioth. Magna Patrum*, iii. 413.

Syncellus and *Methodius*, who thus endeavoured to multiply the admirers and followers of the man. The Latins had hitherto been unacquainted with this imposing system. But when *Michael* the Stammerer, emperor of the Greeks, sent a copy of *Dionysius* as a present to *Lewis* the Meek, A.D. 824,¹ at once the whole Latin world fell violently in love with it. For *Lewis*, to put the Latins in possession of so great a treasure, ordered the works of *Dionysius* to be forthwith translated into the Latin language.² Afterwards, *Hilduin*, abbot of St. Denys, by the order of *Lewis*, published his *Areopagitica*, or Life of *Dionysius*; in which, according to the custom of the age, he not only states many things void of truth, but also shamefully confounds *Dionysius* the Areopagite with *Dionysius* bishop of Paris; designing, no doubt, to advance the glory of the French nation.³ And this fable, caught up by credulous ears, became so firmly fixed in the minds of the French, that it is not yet fully eradicated. The first translation of *Dionysius*, made by order of *Lewis* the Meek, was perhaps considerably obscure and barbarous. Therefore, his son, *Charles* the Bald, procured a new and more neat translation to be made by the celebrated *John Erigena Scotus*; which, being circulated, the patrons of mystic theology arose in France, Germany, and Italy more abundantly than ever. *Scotus* himself was so captivated with this new system of theology, that he did not hesitate to accommodate his philosophy to its precepts, or rather to explain its principles by the rules of his philosophy.⁴

§ 13. In defence of Christianity, against Jews, pagans, and others, only a few took the field; because the internal contests among Christians engrossed all the attention of those who were inclined to be polemics. *Agobard* inveighed against the arrogance and other faults of the Jews in two short tracts. *Amulo* and *Rabanus Maurus* likewise assailed them. The Saracens were confuted by the emperor *Leo*, by *Theodorus Abucura*, and by others whose writings are lost. But these and other opposers of the Mahumedans advanced various false and unsubstantiated statements respecting *Mahumed* and his

¹ Jac. Ussher, *Sylloge Epistolar. Hibernicarum*, p. 54, 55.

² This we are explicitly taught by *Hilduin*, in his epistle to the emperor *Lewis* the Meek, prefixed to his *Areopagitica*, p. 66, ed. Cologne, 1563, 8vo, in which he says: 'De notitia librorum, quos (*Dionysius*) patrio sermone conscripsit et quibus petentibus illos composuit, lectio nobis per Dei gratiam et vestram ordinationem, *cujus dispensatione interpretatos*, scrinia nostra eos petentibus reserat, satisfacit.' Those err, therefore, who tell us that the Latin translation of *Dionysius* was not made till the reign of *Charles* the Bald. And those err also who say (with *Jo. Mabillon*, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. ii. lib. xxix. § lix. p. 488, and the authors of the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 425, &c.) that *Michael* the Stammerer sent to *Lewis* the works of *Dionysius*,

translated from Greek into Latin. The contrary is most clearly signified by *Hilduin*, in the place cited: 'Authenticos namque eosdem (*Dionysii*) libros *Græca lingua conscriptos*, cum *echonomus ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ* et *cæteri missi Michaelis legatione—functi sunt—pro munere magno suscepimus.*' [The date of this event is not 824, as given by *Mosheim*, but 827. *Robertson*, ii. 293. *Ed.*]

³ *Jo. Launoy*, *Diss. de Discrimine Dionysii Areop. et Parisiensis*, cap. iv. Opp. t. ii. pt. i. p. 38, and the other writings of this great man, and of others, concerning the two *Dionysii*.

⁴ [*Scotus* was partial to the *Platonic* philosophy; which, being one of the primary sources of the *mystic theology*, would easily amalgamate with it, and serve to explain and enforce it. *Tr.*]

religion, which (if brought forward designedly, as would seem to be the fact) prove, that the writers did not aim so much at convincing the Saracens as at deterring Christians from apostasy.

§ 14. Among themselves the Christians had more strenuous and animated contests than against the common enemy; and these contests involved them continually in new calamities, and brought reproach upon the cause of true religion. Upon the banishment of *Irene*,¹ the contest about image-worship was renewed among the Greeks; and it continued, with various success, for nearly half this century. For *Nicephorus*,² though he would not revoke the Nicene decrees, nor remove images from the temples, yet laid restraints upon their patrons, and would not allow them to use any violence or do any harm to the opposers of image-worship. His successor, *Michael* Curopalates, was a timid prince, afraid to provoke the monks and priests who contended for images, and therefore, during his short reign,³ he favoured the cause of images, and persecuted their enemies. *Leo* the Armenian had more vigour,⁴ and, assembling a council at Constantinople, A.D. 814, he rescinded absolutely the Nicene decrees respecting the worship of the images of saints; yet he did not enact any penal laws against the worshippers of them.⁵ As this temperate procedure was not satisfactory to *Nicephorus* the patriarch, and to the other friends of images, and as dangerous tumults seemed ready to break out, the emperor removed *Nicephorus* from his office, and repressed the rage of some of his adherents with punishments. His successor, *Michael* the Stammerer, who was also opposed to image-

¹ [A.D. 802. *Tr.*]

² [Who now ascended the throne. *Tr.*]

³ [A.D. 811—813. *Tr.*]

⁴ [And more ingenuousness too. For before calling the council, the emperor, in an interview with *Nicephorus*, requested him to show the fact by proofs from the writings of the apostles and of the earlier fathers, if, as the patriarch asserted, the worship of images was in early use in the church. The answer he received was, that in this case we must be satisfied with unwritten tradition; and that what had been decided in a general council was never to be controverted. After this, the emperor brought the contending parties to a conference in his presence, which *Theodorus Studites* and his party frustrated, by telling the emperor, to his face, that doctrinal controversies were not to be discussed in the palace, but in the church; and that if an angel from heaven should advance a doctrine contrary to the decrees of the Nicene council, they would treat him with abhorrence. The emperor punished this insolence by sending the monks back to their cloisters, forbidding them to raise disturbances about images, and requiring them to be peaceable citizens. *Schl.*]

⁵ [According to *Mansi (Supplem. Concil. i. 755)*, there were several councils held at

Constantinople, under *Leo* the Armenian, in regard to images. One held under the patriarch *Nicephorus*, 814, condemned *Antony*, bishop of *Sykeum*, as an Iconoclast, and established image-worship. The next council, called by *Leo* himself, in 815, deposed *Nicephorus*, and declared him a heretic. The third was held under the new patriarch, *Theodorus*, and established the doctrines of the Iconoclasts. Images were now removed; and the unsubmissive monks were banished, but restored to their cloisters, as soon as they promised to be quiet, and to hold communion with *Theodorus*. There were, however, among them, blind zealots, who, with *Theodorus Studites* at their head, used most shameful language against those bishops and monks who obeyed the emperor, and against the emperor himself. The former they declared to be enemies of Christ, deniers of him, and apostates; the emperor they called an Amorite, another *Og* of *Bashan*, the great Dragon, a vessel of wrath, an *Ahab*, a second *Julian*; and to insult *him*, they extolled their images, by chanting *their* praises in the most public places. These indeed were taken up and punished; and *Theodorus Studites* was sent into exile; and, as this did not tame him, he was imprisoned, yet allowed free correspondence by letter. *Schl.*]

worship, found it necessary to pursue the same course; for although he at first showed great clemency to image-worshippers, he was obliged to lay aside his lenity, and to chastise the restless faction that was enslaved by images, especially the monks.¹ His son, *Theophilus*,² bore harder upon the defenders of images, and even put some of the more violent of them to death.³

§ 15. But after the death of *Theophilus*, in the year 842, his surviving consort, *Theodora*, who administered the government of the empire, wearied out and deluded by the menaces, the entreaties, and the fictitious miracles of the monks, assembled a council at Constantinople, A.D. 842, and there re-established the decisions of the Nicene council, and restored image-worship among the Greeks.⁴ Thus, after a contest of one hundred and ten years, image-worship gained the victory, and all the East, except the Armenian church, embraced it; nor did any one of the succeeding emperors attempt to cure the Greeks of their folly in this matter. The council of Constantinople, held under *Photius*, in the year 879, and which is reckoned by the Greeks the *eighth* general council, fortified image-worship by new and firm guards, approving and renewing all the decrees of the Nicene council. The Greeks, a superstitious people, and controlled by monks, regarded this as so great a blessing conferred on them by heaven, that they resolved to consecrate an anniversary in remembrance of it, which they called the *Feast of Orthodoxy*.⁵

§ 16. Among the Latins, image-worship did not obtain so easy a victory, although it was warmly patronised by the Roman pontiffs. For the people of the West still maintained their ancient liberty of

¹ [Although Michael ascended the throne under a very dubious title, the image-worshippers described him as a second David, and a Josiah, so long as they accounted him one of their party; because he released those imprisoned, and recalled the exiles. He in fact showed great gentleness towards the image-worshippers. He caused conferences to be held, for allaying the controversies; and these proving ineffectual, he allowed them to retain their images, though not to display them in Constantinople; and only required silence from both parties, so that the bitterness between them might subside. This gentleness was the more remarkable, as the superstition of the image-worshippers knew no bounds, and introduced the grossest follies. For they set up images instead of the cross; lighted candles before them; burnt incense to them; sang to their praise; made supplications to them; used them as sponsors for their baptized children; scraped off the colours from the pictures, and mixed them with the wine of the eucharist; and placed the bread of benediction in the hands of the images, in order to receive it as from them. See the Epistle of Michael to the emperor Lewis the Meek, in Baronius's *Annales*, ad ann. 824, § 26. *Schl.*]

² [A.D. 829—842.]

³ [It is impossible to believe all that the Greek monks tell us of the cruelties of this emperor, against the image-worshippers; as he was, in other respects, an upright ruler. And it is well known, that he was very indulgent and kind towards Theoktista, the mother of his empress, who worshipped images in her house, and endeavoured to instil the love of them into the young princesses of the emperor. And if some persons did actually suffer severely under him, they suffered rather on account of their slanderous language, their disobedience to the laws, and their seditious conduct; to which they were prompted by their mad zeal for promoting image-worship. *Schl.*]

⁴ See Fred. Spanheim, *Historia Imaginum*, sect. viii. Opp. ii. 845, &c. Jac. Lenfant, *Preservatif contre la Réunion avec le Siège de Rome*, t. iii. lettr. xiv. p. 147, &c. lettr. xviii. xix. p. 509, &c.

⁵ See Jac. Gretser, *Observat. in Codicum de Officiis Aulae et Ecclesiae Constantinop.* lib. iii. cap. viii. and the *Ceremoniale Byzantinum*, lately published by Reiske, lib. i. cap. 28, p. 92, &c.

thinking for themselves in matters of religion, and could not be brought to regard the decisions of the Roman bishops as final and conclusive. Most of the European Christians, as we have seen, took middle ground between the *Iconoclasts* and the image-worshippers. For they judged, that the images might be tolerated, as helps to the memory; but denied, that any worship or honour was to be paid to them. *Michael* the Stammerer, the Greek emperor, when he sent an embassy to *Lewis* the Meek, A.D. 824, for the purpose of renewing the confederation with him, instructed his ambassadors, if possible, to draw *Lewis* over to the side of the *Iconoclasts*. *Lewis* chose to have the subject thoroughly discussed by the bishops, in the council assembled at Paris, A.D. 824.¹ They decided that they ought to abide by the opinions of the council of Frankfort; namely, that the images of Christ and the saints were not indeed to be cast out of the temples, yet that religious worship should by no means be paid to them. Gradually, however, the European Christians swerved from this opinion; and the opinion of the Roman pontiff, whose influence was daily increasing, got possession of their minds. Near the close of this century, the French first decided that some kind of worship might be paid to the sacred images; and the Germans, and others, followed their example.²

§ 17. Still there were some among the Latins who inclined to the side of the *Iconoclasts*. The most noted of these was *Claudius*, bishop of Turin, a Spaniard by birth, and educated under *Felix* of Urgel. As soon as the favour of *Lewis* the Meek had raised him to the rank of bishop, in the year 823, he cast all the crosses and sacred images out of the churches, and broke them. The next year he published a book, not only defending the procedure, but advancing other principles also, which were at variance with the opinions of the age. Among other things, he denied the propriety of worshipping the cross, which the Greeks conceded; spoke contemptuously of all sorts of relics, and maintained that they had no efficacy; and disapproved of all pilgrimages to the tombs of the saints and to holy places. He was opposed by the adherents to the inveterate superstition; and first, by the abbot *Theodemir*, and afterwards by *Dungal*, a Scot, *Jonas* of Orleans, *Walafrid Strabo*, and others. But this learned and ingenious man defended his cause with energy;³ and thence it was, that

¹ [Fleury, Le Sueur, and the other historians, place unanimously this council in 825.—It may be proper to observe here, that the proceedings of this council evidently show, that the decisions of the Roman pontiff were by no means looked upon, at this time, either as obligatory or infallible. For when the letter of pope Adrian, in favour of images, was read in the council, it was almost unanimously rejected, as containing absurd and erroneous opinions. The decrees of the second council of Nice, relating to image-worship, were also censured by the Gallican bishops; and the authority of

that council, though received by several popes as an *œcumenical* one, absolutely rejected. And what is remarkable is, that the pope did not, on this account, declare the Gallican bishops heretics, nor exclude them from the communion of the apostolic see. See Fleury, liv. xlvii. § 4. *Mach.*]

² Mabillon, *Annales Benedict.* t. ii. p. 488. *Idem*, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* Sæcul. iv. pt. i. p. vii. viii. Car. Le Cointe, *Annales Eccl. Francor.* t. iv. ad ann. 824: and many others.

³ Mabillon, *Annales Benedict.* ii. 488. *Præf. ad Sæcul. iv. Acta Sanctor. Ord.*

long after his death, there was less superstition in the region about Turin than in the other parts of Europe.

§ 18. The controversy, which commenced in the preceding century, respecting the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, and respecting the words, *and the Son (Filioque)*, inserted by the Latins in the Constantinopolitan creed, broke out with greater vehemence in this century; and from being a private dispute, gradually became a public controversy of the whole Greek and Latin church. The monks of Jerusalem contended about this matter, and particularly about the words *Filioque*; and one of their number, *John*, was despatched into France to the emperor *Charles*, A.D. 809.¹ This subject was discussed in the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in this year; and also at Rome, before the pontiff *Leo III.*, whither *Charles* had sent envoys. *Leo III.* approved the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, but disapproved of the alteration of the creed, and wished the words *Filioque* to be disused by degrees.² And his successors held the same sentiments; but the interpolation, being once admitted, retained its place, in spite of the pontiffs, and at length was received by all the Latin churches.³

§ 19. To these ancient controversies new ones were added, among the Latins. The first was, respecting *the manner* in which the body and blood of Christ are present in the sacred supper. Though all

Bened. p. viii. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 491, and v. 27, 64. Among the Reformed, Jac. Basnage, *Hist. des Eglises Réformées*, t. i. period iv. p. 38, &c. ed. in 4to. — [It is to be regretted, that we have only those testimonies of Claudius against the superstitions of his time, which his opposers, and especially Jonas of Orleans, have quoted from his writings. Yet in these quotations, there is much that is solid, and expressed in a nervous and manly style. Against images, he thus expresses himself: 'If a man ought not to worship the works of God, much less should he worship and reverence the works of men. — Whoever expects salvation, which comes only from God, to come from pictures, must be classed with those mentioned Rom. i. who serve the creature, more than the Creator.'—Against the cross, and the worship of it, he thus taught, 'God has commanded us to bear the cross, not to pray to it. Those are willing to pray to it, who are unwilling to bear it, either in the spiritual or in the literal sense. Thus to worship God, is in fact to depart from him.'—Of the pope, he said (when accused for not yielding to his authority), 'He is not to be called the Apostolical' (a title then commonly given to the pope), 'who sits in the apostle's chair; but he who performs the duties of an apostle. For, of those who hold that place, yet do not fulfil its duties, the Lord says, *They sit in Moses' seat, &c.*'—See bishop Jonas, lib. iii. *de Imag.* in the *Biblioth. Patr. Max. Lugd.* xiv. 166. *Schl.*]

¹ See Steph. Baluze, *Miscellan.* vii. 14. [The occasion of this transaction was as follows: some French monks, residing at Jerusalem as pilgrims, chanted the creed in their worship, as was common with their countrymen, with the addition of *Filioque*. The Greeks censured this custom; and the Franks sought the protection and the determination of the emperor. *Schl.*]

² [The conference of the imperial envoys with pope Leo III. is still extant, in Harduin's *Councils*, iv. 970, &c. From this it appears, that Leo was displeased, not with the doctrine itself, but with the unauthorised interpolation of the creed; and disapproved the recent decision of the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, the confirmation of which was requested by the imperial envoys. Pope John VIII., in a letter to Photius, went still further; for he called the expression, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son, blasphemy; though the abolition of it was attended with difficulty and required time. *Schl.*]

³ See Car. Le Cointe, *Annal. Eccles. Francor.* t. iv. ad ann. 809, &c. Longueval, *Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane*, v. 151, and the other writers above cited. [The pope had not, either in the eighth century, or the fore part of the ninth, such influence and authority over the Spanish and French churches, as to be able to compel them directly to expunge the interpolation. *Schl.*]

Christians believed that the body and blood of Christ were presented to the communicants in the Lord's supper, yet up to this time their views had been various and fluctuating, respecting the *manner* in which the body and blood of Christ are present; nor had any council prescribed a definite faith on the subject. But in this century *Paschasius Radbert*, a monk of Corbie, afterwards abbot, in his treatise on the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, written A.D. 831, attempted to give more clearness and stability to the views of the church.¹ Upon the presentation of this book, enlarged and improved, to *Charles the Bald*, in the year 845, a great dispute arose out of it. *Paschasius* taught, in general, that in the Lord's supper, after the consecration, there remained only the form and appearance of bread and wine; and that the real body, or the flesh and blood of Christ, were present; and, indeed, the *identical body, that was born of the virgin, suffered on the cross, and arose from the tomb.*² This doctrine seemed to many to be new and strange, and especially the last part of it. *Rabanus Maurus*, therefore, *Heribald*, and others, opposed it, but on different grounds. And the emperor, *Charles the Bald*, commanded two men of distinguished learning and talents, *Ratramn* and *John Scotus*, to give a true exposition of that doctrine which *Radbert* was supposed to have corrupted.³ Both of them did

¹ See Mabillon, *Annales Benedict.* ii. 539. The treatise of Paschasius was published in a more accurate manner than before, by Edm. Martene, *Amplissima Collectio Veter. Scriptor.* ix. 378, &c. The life and character of Paschasius are formally treated of by Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæcul.* iv. pt. ii. p. 126, &c. and by the Jesuits, in the *Acta Sanctor.* Antw. ad diem 26 Aprilis; and by many others.

² [Far too corporeal conceptions of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist had existed in preceding times, and indeed ever since Cyril's notion of the nature of Christ's becoming flesh, had been received; and the holy supper had been compared to an *offering* or sacrifice. But such gross corporeal expressions, as Paschasius employed, no one had before used; nor had any carried their conceptions so far. In his book, *de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, he says, 'Licet figura panis et vini hic sit, omnino nihil aliud quam caro et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt — nec alia (caro) quam quæ nata est de Maria, passa in cruce, resurrexit de sepulcro; et hæc, inquam, ipsa est, et ideo Christi caro est, quæ pro vita mundi adhuc hodie offertur.' *Schl.* — 'Tria potissimum docet in hoc opere Paschasius: nempe, Verum Christi Domini corpus, verumque sanguinem existere in sanctissimo eucharistiæ sacramento: Panis et vini substantiam, facta consecratione, non supersedere; denique, Ipsum corpus non aliud esse, quam quod de Maria Virgine natum est.' Mabillon *Annal. Bened.* ii. 538. Of course

the great contest is, whether Radbert was or was not a rash speculator, who put forth opinions hitherto unadmitted, if not altogether unknown. The question being vital to modern Romanism, its advocates maintain that he was not otherwise remarkable than as the first distinct enunciator of a doctrine ever held by the church. Mabillon argues that a man of his learning must have known what the church thought, and never could have been so impudent as to feign reception for a belief which the church did not entertain. He confesses, however, that adversaries of Radbert's book arose after a few years, but he pronounces their exceptions to have been of a peculiar nature, unapproved by the church or prelacy, rather indeed rejected by both, and suggested not so much by the thing itself, as by certain modes of speaking. But such representations do not well cohere with the speedy appearance of Ratramn and John Scot's tracts, under royal patronage, nor with Raban Maur's denunciation of Radbert's theory as an *error* and a *novelty*. The archbishop of Mentz was, perhaps, the most celebrated prelate of his day, and following Mabillon's line of inference, it may be said, that he must have known what the church then thought, and never could have been so impudent as to tax that with novelty which had notoriously been established time immemorial. S.]

³ Concerning Ratramn or Bertram, and his book, which has caused so much discussion, see Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat.*

so; but the work of *Scotus* is lost, and that of *Ratramn*, which is still extant, has given occasion to much disputation, both in a former age and in our own.¹

§ 20. The writers who engaged in this controversy were not agreed among themselves, nor were they self-consistent throughout their respective treatises. Indeed, the mover of the controversy, *Radbert* himself, was deficient in consistency, and not unfrequently recedes, manifestly, from that which he had asserted. His principal antagonist, *Bertram* or *Ratramn*, seems in general to follow those who think that the body and blood of Christ are not truly present in the eucharist, but are only *represented* by the bread and wine; and yet he has passages which appear to depart widely from that sentiment; and therefore, it is not without some plausibility that he has been understood and explained diversely.² *John Scotus* only, as being a philosopher, expressed his views perspicuously and properly: teaching, that the bread and wine are *signs* and *representatives* of the absent body and blood of Christ. All the others fluctuate, and assert in one place what they gainsay in another, and reject at one time what they presently after maintain. Among the Latins, therefore, in this age, there was not yet a determinate, common opinion, as to the *mode* in which the body and blood of Christ are in the eucharist.

§ 21. The disputants in this controversy, as is common, taxed each other with odious consequences from their opinions. The most considerable of these consequences was that which, in the eleventh century, was denominated *stercoranism*. Those who held, with *Radbert*, that after the consecration only the forms of bread and wine remained, contended that, from the sentiments of their adversaries, who believed that in the holy supper there was nothing more than the figure or signs of Christ's body and blood, this consequence would follow, namely, that the body of Christ was ejected from the bowels, with the other *feces*. On the other hand, those who rejected the transmutation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ taxed the advocates of this doctrine with the same consequence. Each party, probably, casts this reproach upon the other without reason. The crime of *stercoranism*, if we do not mistake, was a fabricated charge, which could not justly fall on those who denied the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ; but which

Med. Ævi, i. 661, &c. [Concerning *Ratramn*'s book, there has been dispute as to its genuineness, some ascribing it to *John Scotus*, and also as to the doctrine it contains. The Roman Catholics would make it teach transubstantiation; the Lutherans, consubstantiation; and the Reformed, only a mystical or sacramental presence of Christ. *Tr.*]

¹ This controversy is described at length, though not without partiality, by *Jo. Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* [t. vi.] Sæcul. iv. pt. ii. p. viii. &c. With him, compare *Jac. Basnage*, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, i. 909, &c.

² [*Bertram*'s Treatise, in a new English translation, was published at Dublin, A. D. 1753; and with a learned historical Dissertation prefixed. *Mabillon* (*Acta Sanctor.* vi. Præf. p. xxx. &c.) vindicates, triumphantly, the genuineness of the book; and then goes into an elaborate argument to prove, in opposition to *John Claude*, that the author was a believer in the *real presence*. But the mere reading of his argument, with the full and candid quotations it contains, has left on one mind, at least, the conviction, that *Mosheim* has truly stated the character and contents of that work. *Tr.*]

might be objected to those who believed in such a transmutation, although it was probably never admitted by anyone really in his right mind.¹

§ 22. At the very time when the sacramental controversy was at its height, another controversy sprang up, which related to *divine grace and predestination*. *Godeschalcus*, a Saxon of noble birth, and, against his own choice, a monk, first at Fulda, and then at Orbais in France, upon his return from a journey to Rome, in the year 847, lodged with his friend (and, perhaps also relative), count *Eberald*; and there, in presence of *Nothingus*, bishop of Verona, entered into discussion respecting predestination; and maintained, that God had predestinated, from eternity, some to everlasting life, and others to the punishments of hell. When his enemy, *Rabanus Maurus*, heard of this, he first by letter charged him with heresy; and afterwards, when *Godeschalcus* came from Italy to Germany, in order to purge himself, and appeared before the council of Mentz, A.D. 848, *Maurus* procured his condemnation, and transmitted him, as one found guilty, to *Hinemar*, archbishop of Rheims in France.²

¹ Respecting the Stercoranists, see John Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* [t. vi.] Præf. ad Sæcul. iv. pt. ii. p. xxi. Jac. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, i. 926, &c. and the late treatise of the venerable Pfaff, Tübing. 1750, 4to. [It is not easy to determine the precise form of this indecent charge, as advanced by either party. The believers in transubstantiation supposed the sacramental elements not to pass through the human body like ordinary aliments, but to become wholly incorporated with the bodies of the communicants; so that, on their principles, they could not be justly charged with stercoreanism. On the contrary, the opposers of transubstantiation supposed the substance of the sacramental elements to undergo the ordinary changes in the stomach and bowels of the communicant; so that by assuming that these elements had become the real body and blood of Christ, they might be charged with stercoreanism; but it was only by assuming what they expressly denied, namely, the truth of the doctrine of transubstantiation. Thus neither party could be justly taxed with this odious consequence; and yet a dexterous disputant, by resorting to a little perversion of his antagonist's views, might easily cast upon him this vulgar and unseemly reproach. *Tr.*—The justice of this reproach is, however, distinctly admitted by Mabillon. Speaking of the three great principles enunciated by Radbert, he says, 'Ad hæc, tria alia ex his consequentia docet, scilicet, Christum in mysterio quotidie veraciter immolari; eucharistiam et veritatem esse et figuram; denique secessui obnoxiam non esse.' (*Annal. Bened.* ii. 538.) Thus this filthy question was really not left untouched by Radbert himself. It was not,

indeed, likely to be overlooked in the gross discussions of such an age as his. He may be readily considered as little else than the formal enunciator of propositions which had obtained extensive currency; their authority is a very different question. For their currency it is easy to account. The fathers have intermingled with much unfavourable to transubstantiation, many things that its advocates find highly serviceable, their object seemingly being to draw a strong line of distinction between the consecrated elements and common food: two things which scoffers and the thoughtless would be very liable to confound. As critical discernment declined, and superstition advanced, such language could hardly fail of passing with many for assertions of sensible, though veiled divinity, in the elements themselves. *S.*]

² [Nothingus, by letter, gave Rabanus an account of the tenets advanced by Godeschalcus. Upon this, Rabanus wrote a long letter to Nothingus, and another to count Eberald, loading the sentiments of Godeschalcus with reproaches. Godeschalcus, therefore, set out immediately for Germany; in order to vindicate his assailed principles. On his arrival at Mentz, he presented to Rabanus his tract on a twofold predestination. Rabanus laid this before a synod; which condemned the sentiments it contained, but did not venture to punish Godeschalcus, because he did not belong to their jurisdiction, but to that of Rheims. They however exacted from him an oath, not to return to the territories of king Lewis; and transmitted him, as a prisoner, to Hinemar, the archbishop of Rheims. The synodal epistle of Rabanus accompanying the prisoner contained this statement: 'Beit known

Hincmar, who was a friend of *Rabanus*, condemned him anew, in a council held at Kiersy, A.D. 849; and as he would not renounce his sentiments, which he said, and said truly, were those of *Augustine*, *Hincmar* deprived him of his priestly office, ordered him to be whipped, till he should throw the statement made by him at Mentz into the flames; and then sent him in custody to the monastery of Hautvilliers.¹ In this prison the unhappy monk, who was a man of learning, but high-minded and pertinacious, ended his days in the year 868 or 869, retaining firmly, till his last breath, the sentiments that he had embraced.

§ 23. While *Godeschalcus* remained in prison, the Latin church was involved in controversy on his account. For distinguished and discerning men, such as *Ratramn* of Corbie, *Prudentius* of Troyes, *Lupus* of Ferrieres, *Florus*, a deacon of Lyons, and *Remigius*, bishop of Lyons, together with his whole church, and many others, defended with energy, both orally and in writing, either the person or the sentiments of the monk. On the other hand, *Hincmar* his judge, *Amalarius*, *John Scotus*, the celebrated philosopher, and others, by their writings, contended that both he and his opinions were justly dealt with. As the spirit of controversy waxed hotter continually, *Charles* the Bald, in the year 853, ordered another convention or council to be held at Kiersy; in which, through the influence of *Hincmar*, the decision of the former council was confirmed, and

to your goodness, that a certain vagabond monk, named *Gotescale*, who says he was ordained priest in your diocese, came from Italy to Mentz, introducing new superstitions, and pernicious doctrine concerning the predestination of God, and leading the people into error; affirming that the predestination of God related to *evil* as well as to *good*; and that there are some in the world, who cannot reclaim themselves from their errors and sins, on account of the predestination of God, which compels them on to destruction; as if God had, from the beginning, made them incorrigible and obnoxious to perdition. Hearing this opinion, therefore, in a synod lately held at Mentz, and finding the man irreclaimable, with the consent and direction of our most pious king *Hludovicus*, we determined to transmit him, together with his pernicious doctrine, to you, under condemnation; that you may put him in confinement in your diocese, from which he has irregularly strayed; and that you may not suffer him any more to teach error, and seduce Christian people: for we have learned, that he has already seduced many, who are negligent of their salvation, and who say: What will it profit me to exert myself in the service of God? Because, if I am predestinated to death, I can never escape it; but if predestinated to life, although I do wickedly, I shall undoubtedly obtain eternal rest. In

these few words, we have written to you, describing what we found his doctrine to be, &c. See *Harduin's Concilia*, v. 15, 16. *Tr.*]

¹ [The sentence upon *Godeschalcus*, passed by the synod of Kiersy, was thus worded: 'Brother *Gotescale*, know thou, that the holy office of the sacerdotal ministry, which thou hast irregularly usurped' (because, in a vacancy of the see of Rheims, he obtained ordination of the sub-bishop of Rheims), 'and hast not feared hitherto to abuse by wicked manners and acts, and by corrupt doctrines, is now, by the decision of the Holy Spirit (of whose grace the sacerdotal office is the administration, by virtue of the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ), taken from thee; if thou ever receivedst it: and thou art utterly prohibited from ever presuming again to exercise it. Moreover, because thou hast presumed, contrary to the design and the name of a monk, and despising ecclesiastical law, to unite and confound the civil and ecclesiastical vocations; we, by our episcopal authority, decree, that thou be whipped with very severe stripes (*durissimis verberibus*), and, according to ecclesiastical rules, be shut up in prison. And that thou mayest no more presume to exercise the functions of a teacher, we, by virtue of the eternal Word, impose perpetual silence upon thy lips.' See *Harduin, ubi supra*, p. 20. This sentence was executed without mitigation. *Tr.*]

Godeschalcus was again condemned as a heretic.¹ But in the year 855, the three provinces of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles assembled in council at Valence, *Remigius* presiding, and set forth other decisions, in opposition to those at Kiersy, and defended the cause of *Godeschalcus*.² With the decisions of the council of Valence coincided

¹ [In this council, the opposers of *Godeschalcus* set forth *their* creed, in respect to the contested doctrines, in the four following articles: viz.

I. Almighty God created man, without sin, upright, endued with free will; and placed him in Paradise; and purposed his continuance in the holiness of uprightness. Man, abusing free will, sinned, and fell, and the whole human race became a mass of corruption. But the good and righteous God elected, out of that mass of perdition, according to his foreknowledge, those whom he predestinated unto life through grace, and foreordained eternal life for them: but the others, whom in his righteous judgment he left in the mass of perdition, he *foresaw* would perish; but he did not *foreordain* that they should perish; yet, being just, he foreordained eternal punishment to be their portion. And thus we affirm but *one* predestination of God, which relates either to the gift of grace, or to the retributions of justice.

II. We lost freedom of will in the first man; which we recover by Christ our Lord; and we have free will to good, when *prevented and aided* by grace; and have free will to evil when *forsaken* of grace. That we have free will, is because we are made free by grace, and are healed of corruption by it.

III. Almighty God wills, that all men, without exception, should become saved; and yet all men will not be saved. And that some are saved, arises from the gratuity of him who saves; but that some perish arises from their desert of perdition.

IV. As there never was, is, or will be, a man, whose nature was not assumed by our Lord Jesus Christ; so there never was, is, or will be, a man, for whom Christ has not died; and this, notwithstanding all are not redeemed by the mystery of his passion. That all are not redeemed by the mystery of his passion, is not owing to the [limited] magnitude and value of the price; but is the fault of unbelievers, or of them who do not believe with the faith that works by love. For the cup of human salvation, which is provided for our weakness, and has divine efficacy, contains what might benefit all; but if it be not drunken, it will not produce healing.

These doctrinal articles were agreed on in the council of Kiersy, A.D. 853; though sometimes attributed to the council of Kiersy in the year 849, and printed as such

in Harduin, *Concil.* v. 18, 19; compare p. 57. Tr.]

² [The council of Valence published twenty-three canons; *five* of which contained the doctrinal views of the friends and defenders of *Godeschalcus*. See Harduin, *Concil.* v. 87, &c. These five canons are too long to be inserted here, without some abridgment. The substance of them is as follows; viz.:

Can. II. 'That God foresees, and eternally foresaw, both the good which the righteous will perform, and the evil which the wicked will do.' Dan. ii. 29. 'We hold faithfully and judge it should be held, that he foresaw, that the righteous would certainly become righteous through his grace; and by the same grace would obtain eternal blessedness: and he foresaw, that the wicked would be wicked through their own perverseness; and would be such as must be condemned by his justice to eternal punishment.' According to Ps. lxii. 12, and Rom. ii. 7—9, and 2 Thess. i. 7—10. 'Nor has the prescience of God imposed upon any bad man a *necessity*, that he cannot be other than bad; but, what he would become by his own free volition, God, as one who knows all things before they come to pass, foresaw, by his omnipotent and unchangeable majesty. Nor do we believe that any one is condemned by a divine prejudication; but according to the deserts of his own wickedness. Nor do the wicked perish, because they *could not* become good; but because they *would not* become good, and through their own fault remained in the mass of condemnation, or in their original and their actual sin.'

Can. III. 'As to the predestination of God, we decide, and faithfully decide, according to the authority of the Apostle,' Rom. ix. 21—23. 'We confidently profess a predestination of the elect unto life; and a predestination of the wicked unto death. But in the election of those to be saved, the mercy of God *precedes* their good deserts; and in the condemnation of those who are to perish, their *ill deserts* precede the righteous judgment of God. In his predestination, God only determined what he himself would do, either in his gratuitous mercy, or in his righteous judgment.'—'In the wicked, he *foresaw* their wickedness, because it is from themselves; he did not *predestine* it, because it is not from him. The punishment, indeed, consequent upon their ill desert, he foresaw, being a God who foresees

those of the council of Langres, A.D. 859, composed of the same provinces; and likewise those of the council of Toul, A.D. 860, composed of the bishops of fourteen provinces.¹ On the death of *Godeschalcus*, the author of the contest, this vehement controversy subsided.²

§ 24. The cause of *Godeschalcus* is involved in some obscurity; and many and eminent men have appeared, both as his patrons and as his accusers. He taught, unquestionably, that there is a two-fold predestination, the one to eternal life and the other to eternal death; that God does not will the salvation of all men, but only of the elect; and that Christ suffered death, not for the whole human race, but only for that portion of it to which God decreed eternal salvation. His friends put a favourable construction upon these propositions; and they deny, that he held those whom God predestinated to eternal punishment, to be also predestinated to sin and guilt. On the contrary, they maintain, that he taught only this, that God from eternity condemned those who, he foresaw, would become sinners; and condemned them on account of their sins voluntarily committed; and decreed, that the fruits of God's love and of Christ's sufferings should extend only to the elect; notwithstanding the love of God and the sufferings of Christ, in themselves considered, have reference to *all* men. But his adversaries fiercely contend, that he concealed gross

all things; and also *predestined*, because he is a just God, with whom, as St. Augustine says, there is both a fixed purpose, and a certain foreknowledge, in regard to all things whatever.—But that some are *predestinated to wickedness, by a divine power, so that they cannot be of another character*, we not only do not believe; but if there are those who will believe so great a wrong, we, as well as the council of Orange, with all detestation, declare them *anathema*.

Can. IV. In this canon they disapproved the sentiments of some, who held 'that the blood of Christ was shed, even for those ungodly ones who had been punished with eternal damnation, from the beginning of the world to the time of Christ's passion.' And they held 'that this price was paid (only) for those of whom our Lord has said: "As Moses lifted up the serpent," &c., "that every one that believeth in him," &c. John iii. 14—16. "And the Apostle says: Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many."—Moreover, the four articles, adopted without due consideration by the synod of our brethren (at Kiersy, A.D. 853), on account of their inutility, and indeed, their injurious tendency, and error, contrary to the truth; as also those other (of John Scotus), unfitly set forth in nineteen syllogisms; and in which, notwithstanding the boast, that they are not the result of philosophy, there appears to be rather the fabrication of the devil, than an exhibition of

the faith; we wholly explode, as not to be listened to by the faithful; and we enjoin, by the authority of the Holy Spirit, that such, and all similar statements, be looked upon as dangerous, and to be avoided. And the introducers of (such) novelties, we judge ought to be censured.'

Can. V. This canon maintains the necessity of a saint's persevering in holiness, in order to his salvation.

Can. VI. In regard to saving grace, 'and free will, which was impaired by sin, in the first man; but is recovered and made whole again by Jesus Christ, in all believers in him;' this council held with various councils and pontiffs; and reject the trash vented by various persons. *Tr.*

¹ [The five doctrinal canons of the council of Valence, were adopted, without alteration, by the councils of Langres and of Toul. See Harduin, *Concil.* v. 481, &c. 498. *Tr.*]

² Besides the common writers, an impartial history of this controversy is given by Cæsar Egasse de Boulay, *Historia Academicæ Paris.* i. 178, &c., by Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* t. vi.; or *Sæcul.* iv. pt. ii. Præf. p. xlvii., in the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 352, by Jac. Ussher, *Historia Godeschalci*, Hanov. 1662, 8vo, and Dublin, 1731, 4to; and by Gerh. Jo. Vossius, *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. vii. cap. iv. Add Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. Mediæ Evæ*, iii. 210, &c.

errors under ambiguous phraseology; and, in particular, that he wished to have it believed, that God had predestinated the persons who will be damned, not only to suffer punishment, but likewise to commit the sins by which they incur that punishment.¹ This, at least, seems to be incontrovertible, that the true cause of this whole controversy, and of all the sufferings endured by the unhappy *Godeschalcus*, may be traced to the private enmity existing between him and *Rabanus Maurus*, who had been his abbot.²

§ 25. With this great controversy another smaller one was interwoven, relative to the *trine God*. In the churches over which he presided, *Hinemar* forbade the singing of the last words of a very ancient hymn—*Te trina Deitas, unaque poscimus*³—on the ground that this phraseology subverted the simplicity of the divine nature, and implied the existence of *three Gods*. The Benedictine monks would not obey this mandate of *Hinemar*; and one of their number, *Ratramn*, wrote a considerable volume, made up, according to the custom of the age, of quotations from the ancient doctors, in defence of a *trine Deity*. *Godeschalcus*, receiving information of this dissension, while in prison, sent forth a paper, in which he defended the cause of his fellow monks. For this he was accused by *Hinemar* of *Tritheism* also, and was confuted in a book written expressly for that purpose. But this controversy soon subsided; and, in spite of *Hinemar's* efforts, those words retained their place in the hymn.⁴

§ 26. About the same time another controversy found its way from Germany into France, relative to the manner in which our blessed Saviour issued from the womb of his mother. Some of the Germans maintained that Jesus Christ did not proceed from the womb of Mary, according to the laws of nature in the case of other persons, but in a singular and extraordinary manner. When this opinion reached France, *Ratramn* opposed it; and maintained that Christ came into the world in the way which nature has provided. *Paschasius Radbert* came forth in defence of the Germans, maintaining, in a distinct treatise, that Christ was born with no expansion of his

¹ The cause of Godeschalcus is learnedly treated, in an appropriate work, by Gilbert Mauguin; who published all the writings on both sides of this controversy that have reached us, Paris, 1650, 2 vols. 4to; under the title: *Veterum Auctorum, qui nono sæculo de Prædestinatione et Gratia scripserunt, Opera et Fragmenta, cum Historia et gemina Præfatione*. A more concise account of it is given by Henry Noris, *Synopsis Historiæ Godeschalcaneæ*, in his *Opp.* iv. 677, &c. But he more strenuously defends Godeschalcus, than Mauguin does. All the Benedictines, Augustinians, and Jansenists maintain, that Godeschalcus was most unjustly oppressed and persecuted by Rabanus and Hinemar. The Jesuits take opposite ground; and one of them, Lewis Cellot, in his *Historia Godeschalci Prædestinatiæ*, splendidly printed, Paris, 1655, fol. labours

to show, that Godeschalcus was most righteously condemned.

² Godeschalcus, who was committed to the monastery of Fulda by his parents, while an infant, agreeably to the custom of the age, when he became adult, wished to abandon a monastic life. But Rabanus retained him, contrary to his wishes. This produced a great contest between them, which was terminated only by the interposition of Lewis the Meek. Hence those conflicts and sufferings. See the *Centuriæ Magdeb.* centur. ix. c. 10, p. 543, 546; and Mabillon, *Annales Bened.* t. ii. ann. 829, p. 523.

³ [Of thee, trine Deity, yet one, we ask. *Tr.*]

⁴ See the writers of the history of Godeschalcus, who also touch upon this controversy.

mother's body, and charging those who taught otherwise with denying the virginity of Mary. But this also was a short contest, and gave way to greater ones.¹

§ 27. Of all the controversies that disturbed this century, the most famous and the most unhappy was, that which severed the Greek and Latin churches. The bishops of Rome and Constantinople had long indulged, and sometimes also manifested, great jealousies of each other. Their mutual animosity became violent from the times of *Leo* the Isaurian,² when the bishops of Constantinople, supported by the authority and patronage of the [Greek] emperors, withdrew many provinces from their subjection to the see of Rome.³ But in the ninth century the smothered fire which had been burning in secret broke out into an open flame upon occasion of the elevation of *Photius*, the most learned Greek of the age, to succeed the deposed *Ignatius* in the see of Constantinople, by the emperor *Michael*, A.D. 852;⁴ and the confirmation of that elevation, as regular and correct, by the council of Constantinople, in the year 861.⁵ For the Roman pontiff, *Nicolas I.*, whose aid had been solicited by *Ignatius*, in a council at Rome, A.D. 862, pronounced *Photius* (whose election he maintained was uncanonical), together with his adherents, to be unworthy of Christian communion. This thunder was so far from terrifying *Photius*, that it only made him give back that which he had received, and excommunicate *Nicolas*, in the council of Constantinople, of the year 866.

§ 28. The pretence for the war which *Nicolas I.* commenced was the justice of the cause of *Ignatius*, whom the emperor had deprived of his episcopal office, upon a charge, true or false, of treason. But *Nicolas* would have been unconcerned about the injury done to *Ignatius*, if he could have recovered, from the Greek emperor and from *Photius*, the provinces taken from the Roman pontiffs by the Greeks, namely, Illyricum, Macedonia, Epirus, Achaia, Thessaly, and

¹ See Lucas d'Achery, *Spicileg. veterum Scriptorum*, i. 396. Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* [t. vi.] Sæcul. iv. pt. ii. Præf. p. li. &c. [After giving account of this controversy, Mabillon proceeds to the history of another, between Ratramn and Paschasius Radbert, respecting the unity of human souls. The controversy was of short continuance, and seems to have arisen from their misunderstanding each other, in consequence of their not clearly discriminating between numerical unity and a specific unity. See Mabillon, *ubi supra*, p. liii. &c.—There was another controversy, under Charles the Great, respecting the seven-fold grace of the Spirit. Charles asked the opinion of several bishops, whether Christ and believers receive the same extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit. They answered, that Christ received all the seven gifts equally; but that believers receive each his particular gift. The emperor, dissatisfied with their answer,

wrote a tract, to prove that Christ received all the gifts of the Spirit at once, and *in perpetuum*, without change, increase, or diminution: but that believers did not so receive them, though they might in some degree enjoy the temporary possession of them all. See Walch's *Programm. de Gratia septiformis Spiritus*, A.D. 1755. Tr.]

² [A.D. 716—741. Tr.]

³ See Giannone, *Hist. de Naples*, i. 535, 646. Peter de Marca, *de Concordia Sacerdot. et Imperii*, i. c. i. p. 6, &c. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 96, &c.

⁴ [Rather A.D. 858. Tr.]

⁵ [Some of the Greeks call this a general council. It was attended by 318 bishops; and its decrees were subscribed by the two Roman delegates. Its Acts are lost; having probably been destroyed by the adherents to Ignatius. See Walch's *Kirchenversamml.* p. 552, &c. Schl.]

Sicily. For he had demanded them back through his envoys at Constantinople. And when the Greeks paid no regard to his demand, he wanted to avenge his own wrong, rather than that of *Ignatius*.

§ 29. While everything was being hotly contested on both sides, *Basil* the Macedonian, a parricide, who had usurped the empire of the Greeks, suddenly restored peace; for he recalled *Ignatius* from exile, and commanded *Photius* to retire to private life. This decision of the emperor was confirmed by a council assembled at Constantinople, A.D. 869, in which the legates of the Roman pontiff, *Hadrian II.*, had controlling influence.¹ The Latins call this the *eighth general council*. The religious contest between the Greeks and Latins now ceased; but the strife respecting the boundaries of the Roman [pontifical] jurisdiction, especially in regard to Bulgaria, still continued; nor could the pontiff, with all his efforts, prevail on either *Ignatius* or the emperor to give up Bulgaria, or any other of the provinces.

§ 30. The first schism was of such a nature that it was possible to heal it; but *Photius*, a man of high feelings, and more learned than all the Latins, imprudently prepared materials for interminable war. For, in the first place, in the year 866, he annexed Bulgaria to the see of Constantinople, which *Nicolas* was eager to possess; and this was extremely offensive to the Roman pontiff. In the next place, what was much more to be lamented, and unworthy of so great a man, he sent an *encyclic epistle* to the oriental patriarchs on the subject, thus converting his own private controversy into a public one; and moreover accused, in very strong terms, the Roman bishops sent among the Bulgarians, and through them the whole Latin church, of corrupting the true religion, or of heresy. In his great irritation he taxed the Romans with five enormities; than which, in their view, the mind could conceive no greater. *First*, that they deemed it proper to fast on the seventh day of the week or the *Sabbath*. *Secondly*, that in the first week of Lent they permitted the use of milk and cheese. *Thirdly*, that they wholly disapproved of the marriage of priests. *Fourthly*, that they thought none but the bishops could anoint the baptized with the holy oil, or confirm; and that, of course, they anointed a second time those who had been anointed by presbyters. And, *fifthly*, that they had adulterated the Constantinopolitan creed, by adding to it the words *Filioque*; and thus taught, that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father *only*, but also from the Son.² *Nicolas I.* sent this accusation to *Hinemar*, and the other Gallic bishops, in the year 867, that they might deliberate in

¹ The writers on both sides of this controversy, are named by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, t. iv. cap. xxxviii. p. 372.

² See an Epistle of Photius himself, which is the *second* of his Epistles, as published by Montague, p. 47, &c. Some enumerate ten allegations of charge by Photius. But they undoubtedly blend the first contro-

versy with the second, between the Greeks and Latins; and include the criminations which were made in the time of Michael Cerularius [patriarch in the middle of the eleventh century].—Certain it is, that in the Epistle of Photius, from which alone the first controversy is to be judged of, there are only the *five* heads of disagreement which we have stated.

councils respecting the proper answer to it. Hence *Odo* of Beauvais, *Ratramn*, *Ado* of Vienne, *Æneas* of Paris, and perhaps others, also entered the lists against the Greeks, and very warmly defended the cause of the Latins in written vindications.¹

§ 31. In the year 878, *Ignatius* died; and *Photius* was again raised, by the favour of the emperor, to the patriarchate of the Greek church. The Roman pontiff *John VIII.* gave his assent; but it was on condition, that *Photius* would allow the Bulgarians to come under the Roman jurisdiction. *Photius* promised the whole; nor did the emperor seem opposed to the wishes of the pontiff.² Therefore, in the year 879, the legates of *John VIII.* were present at the council of Constantinople, and gave their sanction to all its decrees.³ But after the council the emperor (doubtless with the consent of *Photius*) would not permit the Bulgarians to be made over to the Roman pontiff; and it must be acknowledged there were very strong motives for such a determination. Hence the pontiff sent *Marinus* his legate to Constantinople, and signified that he persevered in the former sentence passed upon *Photius*. The legate was thrown into prison by the emperor, but was again liberated; and afterwards, on the death of *John VIII.*, was created Roman pontiff, when, mindful of the ill usage he had received, he issued a second condemnation of *Photius*.

§ 32. Six years afterwards, A.D. 886, the son of the emperor *Basil*, namely *Leo*, called the Philosopher, again deposed the patriarch *Photius*, and exiled him to a monastery in Armenia, called *Bardi*; where, in the year 891, he died.⁴ Thus, the author of the contest being removed, if there had been due moderation and equity at

¹ Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* t. vi.; or *Sæcul. iv. pt. ii. Præf. p. lv.*

² See Mich. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 103, &c.

³ [The entire acts of this council are in Harduin's collection, t. vi. pt. i. p. 207—342. The council was called by order of the emperor Basil; and by all the Greeks it has been accounted a *general* council: but the Latins do not so regard it. The number of bishops present was 383: and the legates of the Roman pontiff, and also representatives of the three Oriental patriarchs attended it. Photius presided; and the principal objects were obtained, without difficulty, in seven sessions. Photius was unanimously acknowledged the regular patriarch of Constantinople, and all that had been decreed against him, at Rome and at Constantinople, was annulled and declared void. Such as should not acknowledge Photius, were to be excommunicated. The council proceeded to establish the true faith, by confirming the creed of the first Nicene, and the first Constantinopolitan councils, rejecting all interpolations (that is, merely the addition, *Filioque*); and

again enacting the decrees of the second Nicene council, respecting image-worship. The council was closed, by an eulogy of Procopius of Cæsarea on Photius; and by a solemn declaration, on the part of the Roman legates, that whoever would not acknowledge the holy patriarch Photius, and hold ecclesiastical communion with him, ought to be accounted an associate of the traitor Judas, and no Christian; and this was assented to by the whole council. See Walch's *Kirchenversamml.* p. 575, &c. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Photius had ordained one Theodorus a bishop, who was falsely accused of treason. This circumstance brought the patriarch under some temporary suspicion. Besides, the new emperor wished to raise his brother Stephen to the patriarchal chair. He therefore deposed Photius, and gave the office to his brother. Yet, when he learned the innocence of Photius, he seems to have felt some relentings, for he made his exile comfortable, and in a letter to the pope, spoke of him as having *voluntarily* resigned his office, and gone into retirement. *Tr.* from *Schl.*]

Rome, the whole strife might have been quieted, and harmony have been restored between the Greeks and Latins. But the Roman pontiffs required, that all the bishops and priests, whom *Photius* had consecrated, should be deprived of their offices. And as the Greeks would by no means submit to this, all the contentions, respecting points of religion as well as other things, were renewed with increased bitterness; and being augmented by new grounds of controversy, continued till the unhappy separation between the Greek and Latin churches became absolute and perpetual.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES AND CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Writers who explained the sacred rites — § 2. The rites themselves — § 3. Superstitions in civil and private life.

§ 1. THAT many things were added by degrees to the public rites and ceremonies, may even be argued from those who undertook, in this century, to write and publish interpretations of them for the sake of the rude people; as *Amalaricus* (whose numerous explanations, however, are confuted by *Agobard* and *Florus*), *John Scotus*, *Angelome*, *Remigius* of Auxerre, *Walafrid Strabo*, and others. These treatises are entitled *de Divinis Officiis*; for, in the style of this age, a *divine office* is a religious ceremony. Though these works were drawn up, undoubtedly, with good intentions, yet it is difficult to say whether they benefited, more than they injured, the Christian cause. They contained, indeed, some spiritual aliment for those who attended on public worship; but it was, for the most part, crude and unwholesome. For the alleged grounds and reasons of the various rites are, to a great degree, far-fetched, false, constrained, nay, ridiculous and puerile. Besides, excessive regard for external rites was increased and strengthened by this elaborate explanation of them, to the detriment of real piety. For how could anyone withhold respect and reverence from that which he understood to be most wisely ordained, and full of mystery?

§ 2. To describe severally all the new rites adopted, either by Christians generally or by particular churches, would not comport with the designed brevity of this work. We therefore despatch the extensive subject in a few words. The corpses of holy men, either brought from distant countries or discovered by the industry of the priests, required the appointment of new feast-days, and some variation in the ceremonies observed on those days. And as the success of the clergy depended on the impressions of the people respecting the merits and the power of those saints, whom they were invited

to venerate, it was necessary that their eyes and their ears should be fascinated with various ceremonies and exhibitions. Hence the splendid furniture of the temples, the numerous wax candles burning at mid-day, the multitude of pictures and statues, the decorations of the altars, the frequent processions, the splendid dresses of the priests, and *masses* appropriate to the honour of saints.¹ The festival of *All Saints* was added, by the care of *Gregory IV.*, to the public holy days of the Latins.² The feast of *St. Michael*, which had long been observed with much reverence, by both the Greeks and the Latins, became now more popular than ever.³

§ 3. In the civil and private life of Christians, especially among the Latins, there existed many customs, derived from ancient paganism. For the barbarous nations that embraced Christianity would not allow the customs and laws of their ancestors to be wrested from them, though very alien from the rules of Christianity; nay, by their example, they drew other nations, among whom they lived commingled, into the same absurdities. We have examples, in the well-known methods of demonstrating right and innocence in civil and criminal causes, by cold water,⁴ by single combat,⁵ by red-hot iron,⁶

¹ See the Tract of Jo. Fecht, *de Missis in Honorem Sanctorum*.

² See Jo. Mabillon, *de Re Diplomatica*, p. 537. [This holds true only of Germany and France. For, as to England, Bede mentions this feast, in the preceding century; and, at Rome, it had been established by pope Boniface IV. See above, cent. vii. p. ii. c. iv. § 2, note. *Schl.*]

³ The Latins had but few feast-days up to this century, as appears from the poem of Florus, extant in Martene's *Thesaurus*, v. 595, &c. [The council of Mentz, A.D. 813, determined precisely the number of both fasts and feasts to be observed. Canon 34 designates the *fasts*; namely, the *first* week in March, the *second* week in June, the *third* week in September, and the last full week preceding Christmas-eve. On these weeks all were to fast; and were to attend church on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays, at 3 o'clock, P.M.—Canon 36 thus enumerates and sanctions the *festivals*: 'We ordain the celebration of the feast-days of the year. That is, Easter Sunday is to be observed with all honour and sobriety; and the whole of Easter week, we decree, shall be observed in like manner. Ascension day must be celebrated with full worship. Likewise Pentecost, just as Easter. In the nativity (martyrdom) of Peter and Paul, one day; the nativity of St. John Baptist; the assumption of St. Mary; the dedication of St. Michael; the nativity of St. Remigius, St. Martin, St. Andrew; at Christmas, four days, the octaves of our Lord, the epiphany of our Lord, the purification of St. Mary. And we decree the observance of

the festivals of those martyrs or confessors, whose sacred bodies repose in each diocese; and, in like manner, the dedication of each church.'—The 37th canon adds, 'We ordain the observance of all the Lord's days (Sundays) with all reverence, and with abstinence from servile work; and that no traffic take place on those days; nor do we approve, that anyone be sentenced to death, or to punishment,' on those days.—See Harduin's *Concilia*, tom. iv. p. 1015. *Tr.*]

⁴ See Jo. Mabillon, *Analecta Veteris Aevi*, i. 47. Roye, *de Missis Dom.* p. 152. [The ordeal by immersion in cold water was very common in the ninth and following centuries, especially for criminals of vulgar rank in society. It was sanctioned by public law in most countries of Europe. And though disapproved by various kings and councils, yet was generally held sacred; and was supposed to have been invented by pope Eugenius. The person to be tried was conducted to the church, and most solemnly adjured to confess the fact if he was guilty. If he would not confess, he received the sacrament, was sprinkled with holy water, and conducted to a river or lake. The priest then exorcised the water, charging it not to receive the criminal, if he were guilty. The criminal was now stripped naked, and bound; and a rope was tied to him, by which to draw him out, if he sank to a certain depth. When cast into the water, if he floated, he was accounted guilty; but if he sank to the depth marked on the rope (sometimes a yard and a half), he was instantly drawn out, and was accounted innocent. See a large and very

by a cross,¹ and other methods, which were in general use among the

satisfactory account of this ordeal, in Du Cange, *Glossar. Latin.* under the article *AQUÆ*, vel *AQUÆ FRIGIDÆ JUDICIUM*, t. i. 308—313, ed. Francf. 1710.—Du Cange proceeds to describe the ordeal by *hot water*. For this the preparatory religious ceremonies were the same as for the ordeal by cold water. Afterwards the priest heated a caldron of water, till it boiled. Then taking it off the fire, he immersed in it a stone, which he held suspended by a string, to the depth of one, two, or three palms; and the criminal must thrust in his naked hand and arm, and seizing the stone, pull it out. His hand and arm were immediately wrapped up in linen cloths, and a bag drawn over the whole and sealed. After three days, the hand and arm were examined; and if found not scalded, the man was accounted innocent. This ordeal was nearly as much used as the other; but was considered rather more suitable for persons of quality. *Tr.*]

⁵ Jo. Loccenius, *Antiquitat. Sueo-Gothicæ*, lib. ii. cap. vii. viii. p. 144. Even clergymen did not refuse to terminate controversies by the *duellum*, or single combat. See Just. Hen. Boehmer's *Jus Eccles. Protestantium*, v. 88, &c. [The trial by combat originated among the northern barbarians, was in use before the Christian era, and was brought by the Lombards into Italy, and by the Germans into Suabia. It was not an ordeal for the trial of public offences, but was a mode of settling private disputes and quarrels between individuals, when there was not sufficient evidence to make the case clear. The parties deposited with the judge their bonds, or goods to the requisite amount, for paying the forfeiture in case they were cast, and for the fees of court. The judge also appointed the time for the combat, and presided over it. Knights fought on horseback, and armed as for war, in complete armour, and with their horses covered with mail. Common men fought on foot, with swords and shields; covered, except their faces and feet, with linen or cotton, to any extent they pleased. Certain persons, as women, priests, and others, might employ champions to fight in their stead. See the full account in Du Cange, *Glossar. Latin.* article *Duellum*: see also Hallam's *View of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 292, &c., ed. Philadel. 1821. This mode of trial gradually sank into disuse; but it was not abolished by legislative enactments, either in France or England. Hence, so late as the 19th century, the right of challenging to single combat was asserted in an English court. *Tr.*—It has been since abolished. *S.*]

⁶ Petrus Lambecius, *Rerum Hamburg.* l. ii. p. 39. Jac. Ussher, *Sylloge Epistolar.*

Hibernic. p. 81. Johnson's *Laws of the British Church*, and the extracts from them, in Mich. de la Roche, *Mémoires Littéraires de la Grande Bretagne*, viii. 391. [This was a very common ordeal, and was esteemed more honourable than the ordeals by water. Sometimes the person walked barefoot over nine or twelve red-hot ploughshares, treading on each. But more frequently he carried a hot iron in his naked hands, nine times the length of his foot. The religious rites attending this ordeal were very similar to those of the ordeal by hot water. See Du Cange, *Gloss. Lat.* articles *FERRUM candens*, and *VOMERES igniti.* *Tr.*]

¹ See Agobard, *Contra Judicium Dei Liber*, Opp. i. and *Contra Legem Gundobadi*, c. ix. p. 114. Hier. Bignonius, *ad formulas Marculphi*, cap. xii.; Steph. Baluzius, *ad Agobardum*, p. 104; and others. [Du Cange, in *Glossar. Latin.* article *Crucis judicium*, is not able definitely to state what was the mode of this ordeal. He finds some instances of persons standing long with their arms extended horizontally, so as to present the form of a cross. If they grew weary, fainted, and fell, they were accounted guilty. He also finds other modes of trial by cross. Sometimes it was merely laying the hand on a sacred cross, and then uttering a solemn oath of purgation.—On all the forms of ordeal, see Rees's *Cyclopædia*, art. *Ordeal*.—This mode of trying difficult and dubious causes was denominated *Judicium Dei*; and was considered as a solemn appeal to God, to show, by his special interposition, whether a person were guilty or innocent. It was, therefore, a presumptuous attempt to call forth a miracle from the hand of God; and it argued both the ignorance and the superstition of those times. And thus it was viewed by some of the more discerning; for instance, by Agobard, bishop of Lyons. (See the references at the beginning of this note.) But others, as Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, approved and defended both the ordeals, and the trial by combat. *Tr.*—The word *ordeal* (*urtheil*) comes from the old Frankish *Urdela*, *to judge*. It is equivalent to *the judgment*, as if such a mode of terminating controversies were either more noble, or more satisfactory, than any other. Mosheim's view of the ecclesiastical encouragement given to ordeals must be taken with some limitation. Undoubtedly churches were the ordinary scenes of them, and religious rites, among which was the receiving of the sacrament, regularly made part of them. But the Roman church never gave them countenance, and it was, probably, papal disapprobation that drove them into disuse. *S.*]

Latins, in this age and the following. No sober man, at the present day, entertains a doubt, that these equivocal and uncertain modes of deciding causes originated from the customs of barbarians, and that they are fallacious and abhorrent to the genius of true religion. Yet, in that age, the pontiffs and inferior bishops did not blush to honour and dignify them with prayers, with the eucharist, and other rites, in order to give them somewhat of a Christian aspect.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF SECTS AND HERESIES.

§ 1. Ancient sects—§ 2. The Paulicians—§ 3. Persecution of them—§ 4. Their condition under Theodora—§ 5. Whether they were Manichæans—§ 6. Their religious opinions.

§ 1. CONCERNING the ancient Christian sects there is little new to be said. Nearly all of them that were considerable for numbers had their abettors and congregations beyond the boundaries of the Greek and Latin dominions. The *Nestorians*, in particular, and the *Monophysites*, who lived securely under the protection of the Arabians, were very attentive to their own interests, and did not cease from efforts for the conversion of the nations still in pagan ignorance. Some represent the Abyssinians or Ethiopians as being persuaded by the Egyptians to embrace the Monophysite doctrines, in the course of this century. But it was, undoubtedly, from the seventh century, if not earlier, that the Abyssinians, who were accustomed to receive their bishop from the patriarch of Alexandria, embraced the tenets of the Monophysites; for in that century the Arabs conquered Egypt, oppressed the Greeks,¹ and protected the advocates of one nature in Christ; so that this sect was able to subject nearly the whole Egyptian church to its jurisdiction.²

§ 2. The Greeks were engaged with various success, during nearly this whole century, in cruel wars with the *Paulicians*, a sect allied to the Manichæans, and residing especially in Armenia. This sect is said to have been formed in Armenia, by two brothers, *Paul* and *John*, the sons of *Callinice* of Samosata, and to have received its name from them: some, however, derive it from one *Paul*, an Armenian who lived in the reign of *Justinian II.*³ Under *Constans*,

¹ [Or Melchites. *Tr.*]

² *Nouveaux Mémoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jésus dans le Levant*, iv. 283, 284. *Henr. le Grand, Diss. iv. on Jerome Lobo's Voyage Historique de l'Abyssinie*, ii. 18.

³ Photius, *Contra Manichæos*, lib. i. p. 74,

in Wolf's *Anecdota Græca*, t. i. [According to Peter Siculus, the founder of this sect was an Armenian, named Constantine, surnamed Soloannes. Complaint was made against him to Constantine Pogonatus in the seventh century. The emperor sent his commissioner Simeon to investigate the sub-

in the seventh century, it was in an exhausted and depressed state, in consequence of penal laws and oppressions, when one *Constantine* resuscitated it. The emperors, *Constans*, *Justinian II.*, and *Leo* the Isaurian, harassed it in various ways, and laboured for its extirpation; but they were utterly unable to subdue a party so inflexible, and insensible to all sufferings. In the beginning of the ninth century its condition was more prosperous. For the emperor, *Nicephorus* Logotheta,¹ favoured the Paulicians, and gave them free toleration.²

§ 3. But, after a few years of repose, the Paulicians were again assailed, with increased violence, by the emperors *Michael* Curopalates, and *Leo* the Armenian,³ who commanded them to be carefully searched after, through all the provinces of the Greek empire, and, if they would not return to the Greek church, to be put to death. Driven to desperation by this cruelty, the Paulicians of Armenia slew the imperial judges, and likewise *Thomas*, the bishop of Neocæsarea; and then took refuge in the territories of the Saracens, from which they harassed the neighbouring Greeks with perpetual incursions.⁴ Afterwards this war, it seems, gradually subsided; and the Paulicians returned to their former habitations within the Grecian territories.

§ 4. But far greater calamities were produced by the inconsiderate and rash zeal of the empress *Theodora*.⁵ In the minority of her son she governed as regent, and decreed that the Paulicians should be exterminated by fire and sword, or brought back to the Greek church. The public officers, sent into Armenia on this business, executed their commission in the most cruel manner; for they destroyed, by various punishments, about a hundred thousand of this unhappy sect, and confiscated their property. Such as escaped took refuge, once more, among the Saracens. Being there kindly received, they built themselves a city, called *Tibrica*; and choosing *Carbeas*, a man of very great valour, for their leader, and forming alliance with the Saracens, they waged fierce war with the Greeks. This war continued with various success nearly through the century; and in it an immense number of persons perished on both sides, and several provinces of

jeet; and he put the leader of the sect to death, and dispersed his adherents; but some years after he himself joined the sect and became its teacher. Under *Justinian II.* they were again complained of, and their principal leader was burnt alive. But this did not prevent their growth. For one *Paul*, with his two sons, *Gegnæsius* (who was also called *Timothy*) and *Theodorus*, propagated the sect in *Cappadocia*. The first of these was summoned to *Constantinople* by the emperor *Leo*; but after hearing he was acquitted, and retired, with his adherents, into the territories of the *Mahumedans*. He was followed by his son *Zacharias*, who, with *Joseph*, his assistant, again took residence in *Cappadocia*; but when persecution broke out, he fled to *Phrygia*; and for some time taught at *Antioch* in *Pisidia*. He was succeeded by *Bahanes*, under whom the sect

spread itself much in *Asia*, particularly in *Armenia*, and also in *Thrace*. After *Bahanes*, the principal teacher was *Sergius*, called also *Tychicus*, who opposed image-worship most zealously, under the empress *Irene*. They were then likewise called *Athingani*, or *Separates*, because they would have no part in the abuses of the times, especially in image-worship, and in veneration of the cross and of the hierarchy of the reigning party. *Schl.*]

¹ [A.D. 802—811. Tr.]

² See *Geo. Cedrenus*, *Compendium Historiar.* ii. 480, ed. Paris, or p. 379, ed. Venice.

³ [A.D. 811—820. Tr.]

⁴ *Photius*, *Contra Manich.* l. i. p. 125, &c. *Peter Siculus*, *Historia Manichæor.* p. 71.

⁵ [A.D. 841—855. Tr.]

the Greeks were ruined.¹ During these troubles, and near the close of the century, some of the Paulicians disseminated their doctrines among the Bulgarians; which easily took root among that people, as being recently converted to Christianity.²

§ 5. These *Paulicians* are by the Greeks called *Manichæans*; but, as *Photius* himself states, they declared their abhorrence of *Manes*, and of his doctrine³—and it is certain they were not *genuine* Manichæans—although they might hold some doctrines bearing a resemblance to those of that sect. There were not among them, as among the Manichæans, bishops, presbyters, and deacons: they had no order of clergymen, distinguished from laymen by their mode of living, their dress, and other things; nor had they councils, or any similar institutions. Their teachers, whom they denominated *Synecdemi* (companions of this journey) and *Notarii*,⁴ were all equals in rank, and separated from other people by no rights, or regulations, or

¹ Geo. Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiar.* p. 541, ed. Paris, or p. 425, ed. Venice; and p. 547 or 429. Jo. Zonaras, *Annal.* lib. xvi. t. ii. p. 122, ed. Venice. But the principal historians of the Paulicians are, Photius, *Contra Manichæos, Liber primus*; and Peter Siculus, whose *Historia Manichæorum* was published, Gr. and Lat. by Matth. Raderus, Ingolstadt, 1604, 4to. This Peter Siculus, as he himself informs us, was the envoy of Basil the Macedonian to the Paulicians at Tibrice, in 870; sent to negotiate with them an exchange of prisoners; and he remained among them nine months. These facts alone show how great the power of the Paulicians was at that period. From this Peter, it appears, Cedrenus borrowed his account. *Histor. Compend.* p. 431. The moderns, who treat of the Paulicians, as Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, article *Pauliciens*; Jo. Christ. Wolf, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, p. 247, and others, seem to have derived their information chiefly from Bossuet, *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protest.* [liv. xi. § 13, &c.] ii. 129, &c. But this writer certainly did not go to the sources; and being influenced by party zeal, he was willing to make mistakes.—[Photius wrote four books against the Manichæans or Paulicians; of which the *first* book gives the history of them to about 870. The subsequent books are a confutation of their doctrines; and with the common arguments used against the Manichæans: the history of Peter Siculus terminates at the same time; the edition of it by the Jesuit Rader is said to need revision. Photius and Peter agree, in the main, in their histories. Which of them wrote first, remains a question: but Photius is deemed the better authority. For the history of the sect, after 870. we must go to the Byzantine writers, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, l. iv. c. 16, and Cedrenus, p. 541, ed. Paris. See Schroeckh, *Kir-*

chengesch. xx. 363, &c. and xxiii. 318, &c. *Tr.*]

² Perhaps there are still Paulicians, or Paulians as some call them, remaining in Thrace and Bulgaria. There certainly were some there in the seventeenth century; and they resided at Nicopolis, according to Urb. Cerri, *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 72, who tells us (truly or falsely, I know not), that Peter Deodatus, archbishop of Sophia, convinced them of their errors, and converted them to the Roman church.—[The history of these Paulicians is of the more consequence, as they propagated their sect in various countries of Europe, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and composed a large part of the dissentients from the Roman church during those times. The Romanists (as Bossuet, *Variations*, &c. liv. xi.) charge the Protestants with being the progeny of the Paulicians; and some Protestant writers seem half inclined to regard them as witnesses for the truth in their times. This subject will, of course, come up in the following centuries. *Tr.*]

³ Photius, *Contra Manichæos*, lib. i. p. 17, 56, 65. Peter Siculus, *Hist. Manich.* p. 43.

⁴ Quos *Synecdemos*, itineris hujus comites, et *Notarios* appellare solebant, *Orig.* [Συνέκδημοι, fellow-travellers, and *Notáριοι*, notaries. *Tr.* — Συνέκδημος, συνοδοιπόρος. *Hesych.*—The word is also used for a *guide-book*, and the Paulicians probably applied it to their ministers, from considering them not mere companions through the journey of life, but such companions as were serviceable in showing the right way. *Notáριος* was a word adapted from Latin by the later Greeks, and is said by Suidas to be equivalent with *γραμματεὺς*, a *Scribe*. The Paulician ministers, most probably, did any writing that was required for their body. They seem, in fact, very much to have resembled a similar body among the modern quakers. *S.*]

distinctions.¹ They had, however, this peculiarity, that such as were made teachers among them changed their names, and assumed each the name of some holy man mentioned in the New Testament. They received the whole of the New Testament, except the two Epistles of Peter, which they rejected for reasons not known: and they received it unaltered, or in its usual form, as received by other Christians; in which, again, they differed from the Manichæans.² They, moreover, would have these holy books to be read assiduously, and by all, and were indignant at the Greeks, who required the scriptures to be examined only by the priests.³ But many parts of the scripture they construed allegorically, abandoning the literal sense, lest it should militate with their doctrines;⁴ and this construction they undoubtedly put upon the passages relating to the Lord's supper, baptism, the Old Testament, and some other subjects. Besides the New Testament, the epistles of one *Sergius*, a great doctor of the sect, were in high esteem among them.

§ 6. The entire creed of this sect, though doubtless consisting of various articles, is nowhere described by the Greeks, who select from it only six dogmas, for which they declare the Paulicians unworthy to live, or to partake of salvation. I. They denied that this lower and visible world was created by the supreme God; and distinguished the creator of the world and of human bodies from the God whose residence is in heaven. It was on account of this dogma, especially, that the Greeks accounted them *Manichæans*; and yet this was the common doctrine of all the sects denominated *Gnostics*. What opinions they entertained respecting this creator of the world, and whether they supposed him to be a different being from the prince of evil or the Devil, no one has informed us. This only appears from *Photius*, that they held the author of evils to have been procreated from darkness and fire: of course, therefore, he was not eternal, or without beginning.⁵ II. They contemned the virgin *Mary*, the mother of *Jesus Christ*: that is, they would not adore and worship

¹ Photius, l. c. p. 31, 32. Peter Sicul. p. 44. Cedrenus, l. c. p. 431.

² Photius, l. c. p. 11. Peter Sicul. p. 19.

³ Photius, l. c. p. 101. Peter Sicul. p. 57.

⁴ Photius, l. c. p. 12, &c.

⁵ Photius, l. c. lib. ii. p. 147. It is manifest that the Paulicians, with the Oriental philosophers, those parents of the Gnostic and Manichæan sects, considered *eternal matter* to be the seat and source of all evil. And this *matter*, like many of the Gnostics, they supposed to be endued from eternity with motion and an animating principle, and to have procreated the prince of all evil, who was the former of bodies which are composed of matter; while God is the parent of souls. These opinions are indeed allied to the Manichæan doctrines; yet also differ from them. I can believe this sect to

have been the offspring of one of the ancient Gnostic parties, which, though sadly oppressed by imperial laws and punishments, could never be entirely suppressed and exterminated. [Schlegel argues from the allegorical and mystical character of the Paulician method, and from the loss of their writings, that they may have been misrepresented by the Greeks: and adds (quoting Semler, *Selecta Capita Hist. Eccles.* ii. 72, 365), that they had, in several respects, more correct ideas of religion, of religious worship, and of church government, than the prevailing church at that day had; and that they drew on themselves persecution by their dislike of images, and by their opposition to the hierarchy, more than by their other religious opinions.—This supposition is, of course, based entirely on his own prejudice: everything we *know* of the Paulicians is opposed to it. *Ed.*]

her as the Greeks did. For they did not deny that Christ was born of *Mary*: because, as their adversaries expressly state, they taught that Christ brought his body with him from heaven; and that *Mary*, after the birth of the Saviour, had other children by *Joseph*. They therefore believed, with the Valentinians, that Christ passed through the womb of his mother, as water through a canal; and that *Mary* did not continue a virgin to the end of life, which must have seemed abominable to Grecian ears. III. They did not celebrate the Lord's supper. For, believing that there were metaphors in many parts of the New Testament, they deemed it proper to understand by the bread and wine, which Christ is stated to have presented to his disciples at his last supper, those divine *discourses* of Christ, by which the soul is nourished and refreshed.¹ IV. They loaded the cross with contumely; that is, as clearly appears from what the Greeks state, they would not have any religious *worship* paid to the wood of the cross, as was customary among the Greeks. For, believing that Christ had an ethereal and celestial body, they could by no means admit his actual nailing to a cross, and real death upon it: from which naturally came contempt of the cross. V. They rejected, as did nearly all the Gnostics, the entire Old Testament; and believed its writers to have been prompted by the creator of the world, and not by the supreme God. VI. They excluded *presbyters* or elders from the administration of the church. The foundation of this charge, beyond all controversy, was, that they would not allow their teachers to be styled *presbyters*; because this title was Jewish, and appropriate to those who persecuted and wished to kill *Jesus Christ*.²

¹ The Greeks do not charge the Paulicians with any error in respect to the doctrine of baptism. Yet there is no doubt that they construed into *allegory* what the New Testament states concerning this ordinance. And Photius (*Contra Manich.* lib. i. p. 29) expressly says, that they held only to a fictitious baptism, and understood by

baptism, *i.e.* by the water of baptism, the *Gospel*.

² These six errors I have extracted from Peter Siculus, *Historia Manich.* p. 17, with whom Photius and Cedrenus agree, though they are less distinct and definite. The reasonings and explanations are my own.

TENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Propagation of Christianity—§ 2. Presbyter John—§ 3. Rollo embraces Christianity—§ 4. Conversion of the Poles—§ 5. Christianity established in Muscovy—§ 6. Hungary becomes a Christian country—§ 7. Denmark—§ 8. Norway—§ 9. Zeal of *Otto* the Great for Christianity—§ 10. Project of a crusade.

§ 1. ALL agree that in this century the state of Christianity was everywhere most wretched; not only from amazing ignorance, the parent of superstition and moral debasement, but also from other causes. But still there were not a few things which may be placed among the prosperous events of the church. The Nestorians, living in Chaldea, introduced Christianity into Tartary Proper, beyond mount Imaus, where the people had hitherto lived entirely uncultivated and uncivilised. Near the end of the century, the same sect spread the knowledge of the Gospel among that powerful horde of Tartars or Turks, which was called *Carit* or *Karit*, and which bordered on *Chathay*, or the northern part of China.¹ The activity of

¹ Jo. Sim. Asseman, *Bibliotheca Oriental. Vaticana*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 482, &c. Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, p. 266, &c. [Mosheim, *Historia Tartaror. Ecclesiast.* p. 23, 24, states that the prince of the Karit horde commanded more than 200,000 subjects, all of whom embraced Christianity in 900. The authority for this account is a letter of Ebed Jesu, archbishop of Meru, addressed to John, the Nestorian patriarch; and preserved by Abulpharajus, *Chronio. Syr.*, and thence published by J. S. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clem. Vat.* ii. 444. &c. The letter states, that this Tartar king, while hunting, one day got lost in the wilderness, and was wholly unable to find his way out of it. A saint now appeared to him, and promised

to show him the way, if he would become a Christian. The king promised to do so. On returning to his camp, he called the Christian merchants who were there to his presence, received instruction from them, and applied to the above-named Ebed Jesu for baptism. As his tribe fed only on flesh and milk, it became a question how they were to keep the required fasts. This led Ebed Jesu to write to his patriarch, stating the case, and asking for instructions on the point. The patriarch directed the bishop to send two presbyters and two deacons among the tribe, to convert and baptize them, and to teach them to feed upon *milk* only, on fast days. Mosheim thinks the conversion of this tribe is too well attested

this sect, and their great zeal for the promotion of Christianity, deserve praise: and yet no one can suppose that the religion which they instilled into the minds of these nations was the pure Gospel of our Saviour.

§ 2. The Tartarian king, who was converted to Christianity by the Nestorians, it is said, bore the name of *John* (after his baptism), and in token of his modesty, assumed the title of *presbyter*. And hence, as learned men have conjectured, his successors all retained this title, down to the fourteenth century, or to the times of *Ginghis Khan*, and were each usually called *Prester John*.¹ But all this is said without adequate authority or proof; nor did that *Prester John*, of whom there was so much said formerly, as also in modern times, begin to reign in this part of Asia before the close of the eleventh century. And yet it is placed beyond controversy, that the kings of the people called *Kerith*, living on the borders of Cathaia, whom some denominate a tribe of Turks, and others of Tartars, constituting a considerable portion of the Moguls, did profess Christianity from this time onward; and that no inconsiderable part of Tartary, or Asiatic Scythia, lived under bishops sent among them by the pontiff of the Nestorians.²

§ 3. In the West, *Rollo*, the son of a Norwegian count, and an arch-pirate, who was expelled his country,³ and who with his military followers took possession of a part of Gaul in the preceding century, embraced Christianity, with his whole army, in the year 912. The French king, *Charles* the Simple, who was too weak to expel this warlike and intrepid stranger from his realm, offered him no inconsiderable portion of his territories, if he would desist from war, take his own daughter *Gisela* for a wife, and embrace the Christian religion. *Rollo* made peace upon these terms without hesitation; and his soldiers, following the example of their general, yielded assent to a religion which they did not understand, and readily submitted to baptism.⁴ These Norman pirates, as many facts demonstrate, were persons of no religion; and hence they were not restrained, by opinions embraced in early life, from approving a religion which promised them great worldly advantages. From this *Rollo*, who assumed the name of *Robert* at his baptism, the celebrated dukes of Normandy in France are descended; for a part of *Neustria*, with *Bretagne*, which *Charles* the Simple ceded to his son-in-law, was from this time called, after its new lords, *Normandy*.⁵

to be called in question; but the manner of it, he would divest somewhat of the marvellous. He suggests that the saint who appeared to the king might be a Nestorian anchorite or hermit, who was able and willing to guide the king out of the wilderness, on the condition stated. *Tr.*]

¹ See Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 282.

² The late Theoph. Sigef. Bayer purposed to write a history of the churches of China and Northern Asia, in which he would treat particularly of these Nestorian churches in

Tartary and China. See the Preface to his *Museum Sinicum*. p. 145. But a premature death prevented the execution of this and other contemplated works of this excellent man for the illustration of Asiatic Christianity.

³ Holberg's *Naval History of the Danes*; inserted in the *Scripta Societatis Scientiar. Hafniensis*, pt. iii. p. 357, &c.

⁴ Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* i. 296. Gabr. Daniel, *Hist. de France*, ii. 587, &c.

⁵ [It was Neustria properly, and not Bretagne, that received the name of Normandy

§ 4. *Micislaus*, duke of Poland, was gradually wrought upon by his wife *Dambrowka*, daughter of *Boleslaus*, duke of Bohemia, till, in the year 965, he renounced the idolatry of his ancestors, and embraced Christianity. When the news of this reached Rome, *John XIII.*, the Roman pontiff, sent *Ægidius*, bishop of Tusculum, accompanied by many Italian, French, and German priests, into Poland; that they might aid the duke and his wife, in their design of instructing the Poles in the precepts of Christianity. But the efforts of these missionaries, who did not understand the language of the country, would have been altogether fruitless, had not the commands, the laws, the menaces, the rewards, and the punishments of the duke, overcome the reluctant minds of the Poles. The foundations being thus laid, two archbishops and seven bishops were created; and by their labours and efforts, the whole nation was gradually brought to recede a little from their ancient customs, and to make an outward profession of Christianity.¹ As to that internal and real change of mind, which *Christ* requires of his followers, this barbarous age had no idea of it.

§ 5. In Russia, a change took place during this century, similar to that in the adjacent country of Poland. For the Russians, who had embraced the religion of the Greeks, during the preceding century, in the time of *Basil* the Macedonian, soon afterwards relapsed into the superstition of their ancestors. In the year 961, *Wlodimir*, duke of Russia and Muscovy, married *Anna*, the sister of the Greek emperor, *Basil* Junior; and she did not cease to importune and exhort her husband, till he, in the year 987, submitted to baptism, assuming the name of *Basil*. The Russians followed spontaneously the example of their duke: at least, we do not read, that any coercion was used.²

from the Normans, who chose Rollo for their chief. *Macl.*]

¹ Dlugoss, *Historia Polonica*, l. ii. p. 91, &c.; l. iii. p. 95, 239. Regenvolscius, *Historia Eccles. Slavon.* l. i. c. i. p. 8. Hen. Canisius, *Lectiones Antiquæ*, t. iii. pt. i. p. 41. Solignac, *Hist. de Pologne*, i. 71, &c. [Miceslaus II., on the death of his mother Dambrowka, A.D. 977, married a nun, Oda, the daughter of the German marquis Theodorice. This uncanonical marriage was disliked by the bishops, yet was winked at, from motives of policy; and the pious Oda became so serviceable to the church that she almost atoned for the violation of her vows. See Fleury, *Histoire Eccles.* livre lvi. § 13. *Tr.*—It is supposed that Christianity was introduced into Poland from a Slavonic source, and was thus of Greek origin, but became Latinised by means of Oda. The organisation of the church under two archbishops and seven bishops is here placed too early. Posen, the only bishopric, was subject to the archbishop of Magdeburg until 1000, when Gnesen was founded. See Gieseler, ii. 461. Robertson, ii. 439. *Ed.*]

² See Anton. Pagi, *Critica in Baron.* t. iv.

ad ann. 987, p. 55; and ad ann. 1015, p. 110. Car. du Fresne, *Familia Byzantina*, p. 143, ed. Paris. [The occasion of Wlodimir's baptism is variously stated. Some say that he had captured the Greek fortress Corszyn, and promised to restore it, if the princess Anna were given him to wife; but that her brothers, Basil and Constantine, would not consent, unless he would engage to renounce paganism; and he accordingly was baptized at Corszyn, in presence of the court. But the Greek writers know nothing of these circumstances. Others state, that Mahumedans, Jews, and Christians, severally, endeavoured to persuade him to embrace their religions; and that he, gradually becoming informed respecting them all, gave preference to that of the Greeks. So much is certain, that his marriage was the proximate cause of his conversion. After his conversion, he strictly enjoined his subjects to renounce paganism. And it is said, the bishop of Corszyn, and other Greek clergymen, often administered baptism, and destroyed idols at Kiow. A metropolitan of Kiow, named Michael, who was sent from Constantinople, is reported to have gradually

From this time the Christian religion obtained permanent establishment among the Russians. *Wlodimir* and his wife were placed among the foremost of those heavenly personages, whom the Russians venerate; and at Kiow, where they were interred, they are worshipped with extreme devotion to our own times. The Latins, however, hold *Wlodimir* to be absolutely unworthy of this honour.¹

§ 6. Some knowledge of Christianity reached the Hungarians and Avars, through the instrumentality of *Charles* the Great; but it became wholly extinct after his death. In this century Christianity obtained a more permanent existence among those warlike nations.² First, near the middle of the century, two dukes of the Turks on the Danube, (for so the Hungarians and Transylvanians were called by the Greeks in that age,) *Bulosudes* and *Gyula* or *Gylas*, received baptism at Constantinople. The former of these soon after returned to his old superstition: the latter persevering in Christianity, by means of *Hierotheus* a bishop, and several priests, whom he took along with him, caused his subjects to be instructed in the Christian precepts and institutions. His daughter, *Sarolta*, was afterwards married to *Geysa*, the chieftain of the Hungarian nation; and she persuaded her husband to embrace the religion taught her by her father. But *Geysa* again began to waver, and to incline to his former pollutions, when *Adulbert*, archbishop of Prague, near the close of the century, went from Bohemia into Hungary, and reclaimed the lapsed chieftain; and likewise baptized his son *Stephen*. To this *Stephen*, the son of *Geysa*, belongs the chief honour of converting the Hungarians. For he perfected the work, which was only begun by his father and grandfather; he established bishops about the country, and provided them with ample revenues; erected magnificent churches; and by his menaces, punishments, and rewards, compelled nearly the whole nation to renounce the idolatry of their ancestors. His persevering zeal in establishing Christian worship among the Hungarians, procured him the title and the honours of a *saint* in succeeding times.³

brought all Russia to submit to baptism. Churches were also built. Ditmar does not commend the piety of this prince, who is represented as endeavouring to compensate for his transgressions by the extent of his alms. See Semler's continuation of Baumgarten's *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* iv. 423, &c. *Von Ein.*—Mouravieff's *Russian Church*, p. 10, &c. Stanley's *Eastern Church*, Lect. ix. Ed.]

¹ Ditmar of Merseberg, *Chron.* lib. vii. in Leibnitz's collection of the Brunswick Historians, i. 417.

² Pauli Debrezeni, *Historia Eccles. Reformat.* in *Ungaria*, pt. i. cap. iii. p. 19, &c.

³ The Greeks, the Germans, the Bohemians, and the Poles, severally claim the honour of imparting Christianity to the Hungarians; and the subject is really in-

involved in much obscurity. The Germans say that Gisela, the sister of the emperor Henry II., was married to Stephen, king of Hungary; and that she convinced her husband of the truth of Christianity. The Bohemians tell us that Adalbert of Prague induced this king to embrace the Christian religion. The Poles maintain that Geysa married Adelheid, a Christian lady, the sister of Micislaus I., duke of Poland, and by her was induced to become a Christian. We have no hesitation in following the authority and testimony of the Greek writers, at the same time calling in the aid of the Hungarian historians. In this we were, in part, preceded by Gabriel de Juxta Hornad, *Initia Religionis Christ. inter Hungaros Ecclesie Orientali adserta*, Francf. 1740, 4to, who vindicates the credibility of the Greek writers. The accounts of the

§ 7. In Denmark, the Christian cause had to struggle with great difficulties and adversities, under the king *Gorm*; although the queen was a professed Christian. But *Harald*, surnamed *Bluatund*, the son of *Gorm*, about the middle of the century, having been vanquished by *Otto* the Great, made a profession of Christianity in the year 949; and was baptized, together with his wife, and his son *Swein*, by *Adalbag*, archbishop of Hamburg, or, as some think, by *Poppo*, a pious priest, who attended the emperor. Perhaps, *Harald*, who had his birth and education from a Christian mother, *Tyra*, was not greatly averse from the Christian religion: and yet it is clear, that in the present transaction, he yielded rather to the demands of his conqueror, than to his own inclinations. For *Otto*, being satisfied that the Danes would never cease to harass their neighbours with war and rapine, if they retained the martial religion of their fathers, made it a condition of the peace with *Harald*, that he and his people should become Christians.¹ After the conversion of the king, *Adalbag* especially, and *Poppo* with good success, urged the Cimbrians and Danes to follow his example. The stupendous miracles performed by *Poppo* are said to have contributed very much to this result: and yet those miracles appear to have been artificial, and not divine; for they did not surpass the powers of nature.² *Harald*, as long as he lived, endeavoured to confirm his subjects in the religion which they had embraced, by the establishment of bishoprics, the enactment of laws, reforming bad morals, and the like. But his son *Swein* apostatised from Christianity; and for awhile persecuted the Christians with violence. But being driven from his kingdom, and an exile among the Scots, he returned to Christianity, and as he was afterwards very successful,³ he laboured, by all the means in his power, to promote that religion which he had before betrayed.⁴

§ 8. The conversion of the Norwegians commenced in this century, as appears from the most unexceptionable testimony. King *Hagen Adelsteen*, who had been educated among the English, is said to have first commenced this great work, A.D. 933, by the aid of priests from England: but with little success; because the Norwegians were violently opposed to the king's designs. His successor, *Harald Graufeldt*, pursued the begun work; but not more happily.⁵ After these, *Haco*, by the persuasions of the Danish king *Harald*, to whom

others are imperfect, and involved in much uncertainty. [The book of Gottfr. Schwartz, under the fictitious name of Gabriel de Juxta Hornad, gave occasion to a learned controversy, which continued several years after the death of Mosheim. The result seems to have been, that Schwartz's account is substantially true; and, of course, the representation given by Mosheim. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxi. 527, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ Adam Bremens. *Hist.* l. ii. c. ii. iii. p. 16; c. xv. p. 20; in Lindenbrog's *Scriptores Rerum Septentrional.* Alb. Kranz, *Wandalia*, l. iv. c. xx. Ludwig, *Reliquiæ Manu-*

scriptor. ix. 10. Pontoppidan, *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomaticæ*, i. 59, &c.

² See Jo. Adolph. Cypriæus, *Annales Episcoporum Slesvic.* c. xiii. p. 78. Adamus Brem. l. ii. c. xxvi. p. 22; c. xlv. p. 28. Steph. Jo. Stephanius, *ad Saxonem Grammat.* p. 207. Jo. Mölleri *Introd. ad. Histor. Chersones. Cimbr.* pt. ii. c. iii. § 14; and others.

³ [And recovered his throne. *Tr.*]

⁴ Saxo Grammat. *Histor. Dan.* lib. x. p. 186. Pontoppidan, *de Gestis et Vestigiis Danorum extra Daniam*, t. ii. cap. i. § 1, 2.

⁵ See Eric Pontoppidan, *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomaticæ*, i. 66.

he owed his throne, not only embraced Christianity himself, but also recommended it to his people in a public diet, A.D. 945.¹ This effort also was, however, attended with little success among that barbarous and savage people. Somewhat more was effected by *Olaus*, who is called a *saint*.² At length *Swein*, king of Denmark, having vanquished *Olaus Trygguesen*, conquered Norway; and published an edict, requiring the inhabitants to abandon the gods of their ancestors, and embrace Christianity. *Guthebold*, an English priest, was the principal teacher at that time among them.³ From Norway, the Christian religion was transmitted to the *Orkney* islands, then subject to the kings of Norway; to *Iceland* also, and to *Old Greenland*; the inhabitants of which countries, to a great extent, made profession of Christianity in this century, as we learn from various sources.⁴

§ 9. In Germany, the emperor *Otto* the Great, illustrious for his valour and his piety, was zealous for suppressing the remains of the old superstition, which existed in various provinces of the empire, and for supporting Christianity, which was but imperfectly established in many places. By his beneficence and liberality it was that bishoprics were erected in various places, as Brandenburg, Havelberg, Meissen, Magdeburg, and Naumburg; so that there might be no want of spiritual watchmen who should instruct the yet rude and half barbarous people in all the duties of religion.⁵ In accordance with the

¹ Torm. Torfæus, *Historia Norvegica*, ii. 183, 214, &c.

² Torfæus, *Hist. Norvegica*, ii. 457, &c.

³ *Chron. Danicum*, published by Ludewig, in his *Reliquiæ Manuscriptor*. ix. 11, 16, 17. [According to Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxi. p. 376, &c., this Olaus Tryggweson, the son of a petty Norwegian chieftain, spent many years in Russia, and on the Wendish coast of Germany, while his country revolted from Harald Blaataud, king of Denmark, under Hakon their viceroy. Olaus became a successful pirate, advanced in power and wealth; became also a zealous Christian, and in his plundering expeditions in those northern seas, treated the pagans much as the Mahomedans did the same sort of persons; that is, gave them the alternative of baptism, or slavery and death. The Norwegians now chose him their king, and revolted from Hakon. Olaus got possession of the whole country, and by compulsory measures obliged all opposers to embrace Christianity. This was just at the close of the century. *Tr.*]

⁴ Concerning the inhabitants of the Orkneys, see Torm. Torfæus, *Historia Rerum Orcadensium*, l. i. p. 22. For the Icelanders, in addition to Arngrim Jonas, *Crymogææ*, l. i.; and Arius Multiscius, *Schedæ de Islandia*, p. 45, &c.; see the same Torfæus, *Histor. Norveg.* ii. 378, 397, 417, &c. Also Gabr. Liron, *Singularités Historiq. Littér.* i. 138. Concerning Greenland, Torfæus also treats, l. c. ii. 374; and in *Grœnlandia Antiqua*, c. xvii. p. 127. Hafn. 1706, 8vo.

⁵ [It is more probable that Otto the Great had long purposed, by the erection of a new archbishopric, to curtail the power of the archbishop of Mentz. Therefore, in 946, he established the bishopric of Havelberg; and in 949, that of Brandenburg. For establishing the archbishopric of Magdeburg (as we are told by Dittmar, p. 335), the emperor's motives were, *defensio communis patriæ*, and *spes remunerationis æternæ*. The first was, doubtless, the chief motive. The bishop of Halberstadt and the archbishop of Mentz looked upon this innovation with dislike. But the emperor seized the opportunity of their presence in Italy, whither they came to receive their investiture at his hands, to obtain from them the transfer of the suffragan bishoprics of Brandenburg and Havelberg from the jurisdiction of Mentz to that of Magdeburg, and also the transfer of large estates, hitherto possessed by the bishop of Halberstadt. Adelbert, formerly a missionary, and at this time abbot of Weissenberg, was ordained first archbishop of Magdeburg, A.D. 968, by the pope, and received the pallium; and, attended by two papal envoys and the new bishops, repaired to Magdeburg, and was regularly installed. At the same time, he consecrated the new bishops, Boso of Merseburg, Hugo of Zeitz, and Burkard of Meissen; who, together with the bishops of Brandenburg, Havelberg, and Posen, were to constitute his suffragans. See the Saxon annalist, ad ann. 969. *Schl.*]

religious views of the age, he also built many convents, for such as might prefer a monastic life; and he also erected schools. If the illustrious emperor had exhibited as much wisdom and moderation as piety and sincerity in all this, he could scarcely be commended sufficiently. But the superstition of his wife *Adelaide*,¹ and the lamentable ignorance of the times, led this excellent prince to believe that a man secured the friendship of God, by securing that of his *ministers* and servants with great largesses and presents. He therefore enriched the bishops, the monks, and religious associations of every kind, beyond all bounds: of which liberality this fruit was reaped by posterity, that a sort of people sprang from it, who abused a wealth, which they had never earned, in pampering their vices, waging wars, and leading lives of luxury and gaiety.

§ 10. To these accounts of additions to the church it may be subjoined, that the European kings and princes began, even in this century, to think of waging a holy war against the Mahumedans who possessed Palestine. For it was thought intolerable, and a disgrace to the professors of the Christian religion, that the country in which Christ lived and taught, and made expiation for the sins of the human race, should be left under the dominion of his enemies; and it was deemed most righteous and agreeable to the dignity of the Christian religion, to avenge the numerous calamities and injuries, insults and sufferings, which the possessors of Palestine were accustomed to heap upon the Christians residing in that country, or visiting it for religious purposes. Just at the close of the century, and in the first year of his pontificate, pope *Sylvester II.*, or *Gerbert*, sounded the trumpet of war, by writing a letter, in the name of the church at Jerusalem, addressed to the church universal,² in which he solemnly adjured the Europeans to afford succour to the Christians of Jerusalem. But none of them were disposed, at that time, to obey the summons of the pontiff; except the inhabitants of Pisa in Italy, who are said to have forthwith girded themselves for the holy war.³

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Progress of the Turks and Saracens—§ 2. In the West, the barbarians distress the Christians—§ 3. Effects of these evils.

§ 1. No king, in this century, who was an alien from Christ, except *Gorm* and *Swein*, kings of Denmark, directly, and with set purpose,

¹ See her life, in Henr. Canisius, *Lectiones Antiquæ*, t. iii. pt. i. p. 69.

² This is the twenty-eighth epistle of the first part in the Collection of the Epistles

of Sylvester II., published by Du Chesne, in vol. iii. of the *Scriptores Histor. Franc.*

³ See Muratori, *Scriptores Rerum Italicar.* iii. 400.

persecuted the Christians living under his jurisdiction. And yet they could not live in security and safety, either in the East or in the West. The Saracens in Asia and Africa, though troubled with internal dissensions and various other calamities, were yet very assiduous in propagating their religion, that of Mahumed; nor were they unsuccessful. How much this diminished the number of Christians, it is not easy to ascertain. But they brought over the Turks, an uncivilised people, inhabiting the northern shores of the Caspian sea, to their religion. This agreement in religious faith, however, did not prevent the Turks, when afterwards called in to aid the Persians, from depriving the Saracens, in the first place, of the vast kingdom of Persia; and afterwards, with astonishing celerity and success, invading and conquering other provinces subject to their dominion. Thus the empire of the Saracens, which the Greeks and Romans had for so many years in vain attempted to hold in check, was dismembered, and at length subverted by their friends and allies; and the very powerful empire of the Turks, which has not yet ceased to be terrible to Christians, gradually took its place.¹

§ 2. In the countries of the West, the nations that were still pagans were in general very grievous foes to the Christians. The Normans, during nearly half the century, inflicted the severest blows upon the Franks and others. The Prussians, the Slavonians,² the Bohemians, and others to whom Christianity was unknown and hateful, not only laboured with great violence to drive it from their countries, but likewise frequently laid waste, in the most distressing manner, with fire and sword, the neighbouring countries in which it was received. The Danes did not cease to molest the Christians, till after *Otto* the Great had conquered them. The Hungarians assailed Germany, and harassed various parts of the country with indescribable cruelties. The tyranny of the Arabs in Spain, and their frequent incursions upon Italy and the neighbouring islands, I pass without further notice.

§ 3. Whoever considers attentively the numberless calamities which the Christian nations suffered from those who were not Christian, will readily perceive a sufficient cause for that unwearied zeal of Christian princes for the conversion of these furious and savage nations. They had the motives not merely of religion and virtue, but likewise of security and peace. For they expected, and with good reason, that those fierce minds would be softened and

¹ These events Jo. Leunclavius has endeavoured to elucidate, in his *Annales Turcici*, often reprinted. See also Geo. Elmacin, *Historia Saracénica*, lib. ii. iii. p. 190, 203, 210, &c.

² [These distinguished themselves, especially by the outrages they committed upon the Christian churches, in their insurrections against their Christian margraves. Humanity shudders at the narrations of the historians; that when these Slavonians took Brandenburg, they not only enslaved or

slew all the clergy, but drew the corpse of Dodilo, the deceased bishop, from its grave, in order to strip it of its clothing; that after capturing the city of Altenburg, they dragged sixty priests, whom they had not butchered, from one city to another, till they all died; and among these, Oddar, a provost, they tortured by ripping up his scalp, in the form of a cross, and laying bare his brain; so that he died in the midst of extreme anguish. See the Saxon *Annalist*, ad ann. 988; and Ditmar, p. 345. *Schl.*]

rendered humane, by the influences of Christianity. Therefore they proffered matrimonial connexion with their kings and chieftains, assistance against their enemies, the possession of valuable lands, and other temporal advantages, if they would only renounce the religions of their ancestors, which were altogether military, and calculated to foster ferocious feelings: and those kings and chieftains, influenced by these offers and advantages, listened themselves to Christian instruction, and endeavoured to bring their subjects to do the same.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of learning among the Greeks—§ 2. Few good writers among them—§ 3. State of learning among the Saracens—§ 4, 5. The Western nations—§ 6. The state of philosophy—§ 7. Sylvester a restorer of learning—§ 8. Arabian learning.

§ 1. It is universally admitted that the ignorance of this century was extreme, and that learning lay utterly neglected. Nor is this greatly to be wondered at, considering what wars and distressing calamities agitated both the East and the West, and how great was the turpitude of those to whom the guardianship of truth and virtue was intrusted. *Leo* the Wise, who ruled the Greek empire at the beginning of the century, both cultivated learning himself, and excited others to do so.¹ His son, *Constantine* Porphyrogenitus, was still more solicitous to revive literature and the arts.² For it appears

¹ See Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* lib. v. pt. ii. cap. v. p. 363. [*Leo* VI. reigned from 886 to 911. The learned *Photius* had been his instructor. His learning procured him the titles of the *Wise* and the *Philosopher*. He completed the begun revision of the imperial laws by his father, and published the result in sixty books, entitled *Βασιλικά*, or *Βασιλικά διατάξεις*. It is a Greek translation of *Justinian's Corpus Juris Civilis*, with extracts from the commentaries of the Greek Jurists, the laws of subsequent emperors, and the decisions of ecclesiastical councils, &c. But much of the originals is omitted, or changed, or enlarged. C. D. Fabrotti published a Latin translation of forty-one books, and an abstract of the remaining books, Paris, 1647, seven vols. fol. This emperor's book on the art of war, compiled from earlier writers, was published by Meursius, Greek and Latin, Leyden, 1612, 4to. His letter to the Saracen Omar, in favour of Christianity, exists in Chaldaic; from which there is a Latin translation in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Lugdun. t. xvii.—Baronius (*Annal.* A.D. 911, § 3), gives account of thirty-three religious Discourses of this emperor; and Gretser has

published nine more, Ingoldst. 1600, 4to. They were chiefly designed for the feast days, and are of little value. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxi. 127, &c. *Tr.*]

² Fabricius, l. c. cap. v. p. 486. [*Constantine* Porphyrogenitus reigned from 911 to 959. The historical, political, and moral compendiums which he caused to be made out from the earlier writers, were arranged under 53 heads or titles; and were intended to embrace all that was most valuable on those subjects. Only two of the 53 are now to be found; namely, the 27th, relating to the diplomatic intercourse of the Romans with foreign nations (published, partly Antwerp, 1582, 4to, and partly Augsburg, 1603, 4to); and the 50th, respecting virtue and vice; of which a part was published by Valesius, Paris, 1634, 4to. The titles of some of the others are known; e.g. on the proclamations of kings; on heroic deeds; on festivals; on public addresses; on manners; on ecclesiastical persons and things; on epistles; on the chase; on war; on the establishment of colonies; on strange occurrences, &c. Among the emperor's own compositions were, a biography of his grandfather, Basil; two books on the military

that he supported learned men of various descriptions, at great expense: he carefully collected the writings of the earlier ages: he was himself an author, and he prompted others to write; he wished to have all that was most valuable in the works of the ancients to be selected, and arranged under appropriate heads; and he re-animated, as it were, the study of philosophy which was extinct.¹ Few of the Greeks, however, copied after these noble examples; nor was there anyone among the subsequent emperors equally friendly to literature and to the cultivation of the mind. Indeed it is supposed that *Constantine* Porphyrogenitus himself, though the Greeks pronounce him the restorer of all branches of learning, undesignedly injured the cause of learning by his excessive zeal to advance it. For, having caused extracts and abridgments to be compiled by learned men from the writers of preceding ages, in order to elucidate the various branches of knowledge and render them serviceable to the world, the slothful Greeks, now contenting themselves with these *abridgments* of the emperor, neglected the writers from whom they were compiled; and therefore many excellent authors of the earlier period became lost, through the neglect of the Greeks from this time onward.

§ 2. Few writers, therefore, can be named among the Greeks, on whom a wise and judicious man will place a high value; and in a short time the literary seed sown, which seemed to promise a rich harvest, was found to be dead. The philosophers, if such characters flourished among them, produced no immortal works, and worthy of remembrance by posterity. The body of learned Greeks was almost wholly composed of a few rhetoricians, some grammarians, here and there a poet who was above contempt, and a number of historians, who, though not of the first order, were not destitute of all merit: for the Greeks seemed to find pleasure almost exclusively in those species of literature in which the imagination, the memory, and industry, have most concern.

§ 3. Egypt, though groaning under an oppressive yoke, produced some learned men, who might contend with the Greeks for the palm of superiority. The example of *Eutychius*, to mention no others, is evidence of this; for that bishop of Alexandria did honour to the sciences of medicine and theology by his various productions. Among the other Arabians, that noble ardour for useful knowledge, which was awakened in the preceding age, continued unabated through this whole century; so that there was among them a large number of eminent physicians, philosophers, and mathematicians, whose names

stations and garrisons of the empire; instructions to his son, respecting the state and the foreign relations of the empire, and the course it would be wise for him to pursue; narrative respecting the likeness of Christ found at Edessa; on naval and military tactics; on the mode of warfare by different nations; and some compilations on farriery, agriculture, breeding cattle, physic, &c.,

together with a large work, entitled the *Ceremonial of the Court of Constantinople*, describing minutely all the etiquette there practised. It was published by Reiske, Lips. 1751—54, 2 vols. fol. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxi. 129, &c. Tr.]

¹ This is expressly asserted by Jo. Zonaras, *Annal.* iii. 155, ed. Paris.

and literary labours are celebrated by *Jo. Leo Africanus* and by others.

§ 4. All the Latins were sunk in great barbarism. Most writers are agreed, that this century deserves the name of the *iron age*, so far as respects literature and science; and that the Latin nations never saw an age more dark and cheerless.¹ And though some excellent men have questioned this fact, it is too firmly established to be wholly disproved.² Schools existed, indeed, in most countries of Europe, either in the monasteries or in the cities which were the sees of bishops; and there likewise shone forth, in various places, especially at the close of the century, some distinguished geniuses, who attempted to soar above the vulgar. But these can easily be all counted up; and the smallness of their number is itself a witness to the infelicity of the times. In the schools nothing was taught but the seven liberal arts, as they were called; and the teachers were monks, who estimated the value of learning and science solely by their use in matters of religion.

§ 5. The best among the monks, who were disposed to employ a portion of their leisure to some advantage, applied themselves to

¹ Proofs of the ignorance of the age have been collected by Cæs. Egasse de Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*. i. 288, &c. Ludov. Ant. Muratori, *Antiqq. Ital. Medii Ævi*, iii. 831, &c.; and ii. 141; and by others. [Among collectors of such proofs may be mentioned Abp. Ussher, in his work *De Christianarum Ecclesiarum Successione et Statu*, p. 31. The learned primate's principal object in arraying these testimonies, is to show this age as a fit preparative for the loosing of Satan, as he speaks, meaning the triumph of popery, which he places in the next century. It certainly is remarkable, that in the eleventh century, Rome first formally committed herself, in the condemnation of Berenger, to the doctrine of transubstantiation, and in the person of Gregory VII. put forth some of those assertions of papal supremacy, which eventually made so much noise. The doctrine of transubstantiation is, undoubtedly, the main pillar of Romish peculiarities; and it rests upon that alleged infallibility of which the papal see is either the depository or the centre. *S.*]

² Godfr. Wm. Leibnitz, *Præf. ad Codicem Juris Naturæ et gentium Diplomati*, maintains that this tenth century was not so dark as the following centuries, and, particularly, not so dark as the twelfth and thirteenth. But he certainly is extravagant, and labours in vain. More deserving of a hearing are Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Sæcul. v. Præf.* p. ii. &c.—the authors of the *Literary History of France*, vi. 18, &c. Jac. le Beuf, *Diss. de Statu Litterar. in Francia, a Carolo M. ad Regem Robert.*, and some others;

who, while they admit that the ignorance of this age was great, contend that its barbarism was not altogether so great as it is commonly supposed. In the proofs which they allege, there is considerable deficiency; but still we may admit that all science was not entirely extinct in Europe; and that there was a number of persons who were wise above the mass of people; but that the number was a very moderate one, nay, really small, may be gathered from the monuments of the age.—[The opinion of Leibnitz was embraced by Semler. (Continuation of Baumgarten's *Kirchengesch.* iv. 463, &c.; and *Hist. Eccles. Selecta Capita*, ii. 528, &c.) His arguments seem not easily answered. The tenth century afforded more writers, in whom sound reasoning was combined with some learning, than the twelfth and thirteenth. It had greater and better princes; and in the years and the countries in which the Normans and Huns spread no general desolation, there were more numerous episcopal and monastic schools, in which the young received some instruction, though rude and meagre. The most noted episcopal schools were those of Mentz, Treves, Cologne, Magdeburg, Würzburg, Paris, Tours, Rheims, Metz, Toul, and Verdun; and among the monastic schools were those of Fleury, Clugni, Laubes, Gortz, Corbey, Fulda, St. Emmeran, Epternach, St. Gall, &c. Every teacher, and nearly every cloister, procured a stock of the classical writers. The Greek language was not wholly unknown; although those who could understand the ancients in the originals were becoming more and more rare. *Schl.*]

writing annals and history of a coarse texture. For instance, *Abbo*,¹ *Luitprand*,² *Wittekind*,³ *Fulcuin*,⁴ *John of Capua*,⁵ *Ratherius*,⁶ *Flodoard*,⁷ *Notkerus*,⁸ *Ethelbert*,⁹ and others; of whom some are indeed better than others, but they all wander very far from the true method of composing history. Of their poets, one and another shows himself to be not void of genius; but all are rude, on account of the infelicity of the times, which could relish nothing elegant or exquisite. The grammarians and rhetoricians of those times are scarcely worthy to be mentioned; for they either give out absolute nonsense, or inculcate precepts which are jejune and injudicious. Of their geometry,

¹ [Abbo, born at Orleans, educated at Fleury, Paris, Rheims, and Orleans, was called to England by the archbishop of York, to preside over a monastic school. (about 986, *Ed.*) After two years, he returned to Fleury, became abbot, and resided there till his death in 1004. He wrote an Epitome of the lives of the popes, compiled from Anastasius; a life of St. Edmund, king of the East Angles; Collection or Epitome of canons; several Epistles and short Tracts. See Cave, *Hist. Litt. ii. Tr.*]

² [Luitprand was born at Pavia, or in Spain; was envoy of Berengarius, king of Italy, to Constantinople, A.D. 946; created bishop of Cremona, he became odious to Berengarius, and was deposed A.D. 963, or earlier, and retired to Frankfort. The emperor Otho sent him again to Constantinople, A.D. 968. He was alive A.D. 970. He was a man of genius, and of considerable learning, and wrote in Greek as well as Latin. His works are, a History of Europe during his own times, in six books; and an Account of his embassy to Constantinople in 968. To him also are falsely attributed, a tract on the lives of the popes, from St. Peter to Formosus, and a *Chronicon*. All these, together with his *Adversaria*, or Notebook, were printed, Antwerp, 1640, fol.—See Cave, l. c. *Tr.*]

³ [Witkind, or Winduchind, was a Saxon, and a monk of Corbey in Germany, who flourished A.D. 940, and onwards. He wrote a History of the Saxons, or the reigns of Henry the Fowler, and Otto I., in three books; published Basil. 1532, Frankf. 1677, and among the *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*; likewise some poetry. See Cave, l. c. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Fulcuin, or Folguin, abbot of Laubes (Laubiensis) from 965 to 990. He wrote a *Chronicon de Rebus gestis Abbatum Laubiensis Cœnobii; de Miraculis Sti Ursmari; and Vita Folcuini Ep. Tarvanensis. Tr.*]

⁵ [John Capuanus, abbot of Monte Cassino, flourished from 915 to 934. He wrote *de Persecutionibus Cœnobii Cassinensis [a Saracenorum irruptione], et de Miraculis*

inibi factis, Chronicon succinctum: also Chronicon postremorum Comitum Capuæ. See Cave, l. c. Tr.]

⁶ [Ratherius, a monk of stern manners, and prone to give offence, was bishop of Verona A.D. 928; displaced in 954, and made bishop of Liege; resigned, and was again bishop of Verona; was again removed, and retired to his monastery of Laubes, where he died, A.D. 973. His works, as published by L. D'Achery, *Spicileg. t. ii.*, comprise various epistles, apologies, polemic tracts, a few sermons, and a life of St. Ursmar of Laubes. His *Chronographia* is said to have existed in MS. in the monastery of Gemblours. See Cave, l. c. *Tr.*]

⁷ [Flodoard, or Frodoard, a canon of Rheims, who died A.D. 966, aged seventy-three years. His *Chronicon Rerum inter Francos gestarum*, from 919 to 996, was published, Paris, 1588, 8vo, and Frankf. 1594, 8vo. His *Historie Ecclesiæ Remensis libri iv.* was edited by Sirmond, Paris, 1611, 8vo; Douay, 1617, 8vo; and in the *Biblioth. Patr. xvii.* 500. His poetic lives of various ancient saints, in about twenty books, were never published. See Cave, l. c. *Tr.*]

⁸ [Notker, or Notger, bishop of Liege, A.D. 971—1007. He wrote *Historia Episcoporum Trajectensium (seu Leodicensium)*, but whether it is the same that was published by Jo. Chapeauville, Liege, 1612, is doubted. He also wrote the life of St. Landoald, a Roman presbyter; a life of St. Remaclus, bishop of Utrecht, and on the miracles of St. Remaclus, two books. It was another Notger, of the preceding century, who died A.D. 912, and who was a monk of St. Gall, whose Martyrology was published by Canisius, iv. 761. See Cave, l. c. *Tr.*]

⁹ [Ethelwerd was of royal English blood, and flourished A.D. 980. He wrote *Historia brevis*, libris iv.; which is a concise Chronology, from the creation to the Saxon invasion of England; and then a more full and a bombastic history of England, down to 974. It was published by Saville, with the *Scriptores Anglici*, London, 1596, fol. p. 472. *Tr.*]

arithmetic, *Computus*,¹ astronomy, and music, which had a place in their schools, it is unnecessary to give any description.

§ 6. The philosophy of the Latins was confined wholly to logic, which was supposed to contain the marrow of all wisdom. Moreover, this logic, which was so highly extolled, was usually taught without method and without clearness, according to the book on the *Categories*, falsely ascribed to *Augustine*, and the writings of *Porphyry*. It is true, that *Plato's* *Timæus*, *Aristotle's* tract *de Interpretatione*, and his as well as *Cicero's* *Topics*, and perhaps some other treatises of the Greeks and Latins, were in the hands of some persons; but they who inform us of the fact add, that there were none who could understand these books.² And yet, strange as it may appear, it was in the midst of this darkness, that the subtle question was raised, respecting the nature of *universals*,³ as they are called; namely, *whether they belong to the class of real existences, or are mere names*. This would not seem the time for starting a controversy, which in after days distracted so vehemently the minds of Latin scholars, and divided them into the sects of *Nominalists* and *Realists*. But, undoubtedly, the first traces of this long and thorny strife are discoverable everywhere in the books of learned men, as early as this century.⁴

§ 7. Towards its close, the cause of learning in Europe obtained a great and energetic patron, in *Gerbert*, a Frenchman, known among the Roman pontiffs, as bearing the name of *Sylvester II*. This great and exalted genius pursued successively all branches of learning, but especially mathematics, mechanics, geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and the kindred sciences; and both wrote upon them himself, and roused others to cultivate and advance them, to the utmost of his power. The effects of his efforts, among the Germans, French, and Italians, were manifest in this century and the next; for many men of those nations were stimulated, by the writings, the example, and the exhortations of *Gerbert*, to the zealous pursuit of philosophy, mathematics, medicine, and other branches of human science. *Gerbert* cannot indeed be compared with our geometricians and mathematicians, as is manifest from his *Geometry*, which is a plain and perspicuous treatise, but, at the same time, imperfect and superficial.⁵ And yet his knowledge was too profound for the comprehension of that barbarous age. For the ignorant monks supposed his geometrical diagrams to be magical figures; and therefore set down this learned man among magicians and disciples of the evil one.⁶

¹ [Calculation of the feast-days. *Tr.*]

² Gunzo, *Epist. ad Monachos Augienses*, in Martene's *Collectio ampliss. Monumentorum Veter.* iii. 304.

³ [General ideas. *Tr.*]

⁴ Gunzo, a learned monk, l. c. p. 304, says:—'Aristoteles genus, speciem, differentiam, proprium et accidens subsistere denegavit, quæ Platoni subsistentia persuasit. Aristoteli an Platoni magis credendum

putatis? Magna est utriusque auctoritas, quatenus vix audeat quis alterum alteri dignitate præferre.' This is a clear exhibition of the apple of discord among the Latins. Gunzo did not venture to offer a solution of the difficult question; but others attempted it afterwards.

⁵ It was published by Bernh. Pez, *Thesaur. Anecd.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 7, &c.

⁶ See the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 558.

§ 8. For a part of his knowledge, especially of philosophy, medicine, and mathematics, *Gerbert* was indebted to the books and schools of the Arabians in Spain. He went himself into that country as a student, and attended lectures of the Arab doctors at Cordova and Seville.¹ Perhaps his example, in this respect, had an influence upon the Europeans. This at least is most certain, that from this time onward, such of the Europeans as were eager for instruction, especially in medicine, arithmetic, geometry, and philosophy, had a strong desire to read and hear the Arabians, who lived in Spain, and in a part of Italy. Many of their books, accordingly, were translated into Latin, and much of their contents was brought forward in the European schools; nor was the number small of those who actually went into Spain, to get oral instructions from the Arabian professors themselves. And truth requires us to say, that from the Saracens, or Arabs, particularly of Spain, chiefly came whatever knowledge of medicine, philosophy, astronomy, and mathematics, flourished in Europe, from the tenth century onward.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The clergy corrupt—§ 2. History of the Roman pontiffs—§ 3. John X., pope—§ 4. John XI. and John XII.—§ 5. Fate of the latter—§ 6. John XIII. and Benedict VII.—§ 7. John XIV. and John XV.—§ 8. Aggrandisement of the popes—§ 9. The bishops and abbots increase in power—§ 10. Principal vices of the clergy—§ 11. Low state of discipline in the monasteries—§ 12. Principal writers in the Greek church—§ 13. Writers in the Latin church.

§ 1. NOTHING is more incontrovertible, than that the sacred order, both in the East and in the West, was composed principally of men

Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* i. 314, 319, &c. Gab. Naud. *Apologie pour les grands hommes faussement accusez de la Magie*, cap. xix.

§ 4. [Gerbert was a monk of Auvergne, and early devoted himself to study. After much proficiency in France, he attended the schools of the Saracens in Spain; and returned the most scientific man in the Latin church. In 968, the emperor Otto I. met with him in Italy, and made him abbot of Bobbio in 972; but he soon left that station to become secretary to Adalbero, archbishop of Rheims. He now taught the archiepiscopal school, which flourished greatly under him. In 991 he was made archbishop of Rheims; but was deposed by pope John XV. in 995; and soon after made archbishop of Ravenna. On the death of Gregory V., A.D. 999, he was, by Otto's influence, created pope, and assumed the title of Sylvester II. He died

A.D. 1003.—While at Rheims he wrote 160 Letters; which were published by Masson, Paris, 1611, 4to, and then in Duchesne's *Scriptores Francic.* ii. and in *Biblioth. Patr.* xvii. While pope, he wrote three Epistles, one of which, in the name of Jerusalem, calls upon Christians to rescue that city from the hands of infidels. He also wrote *de Geometria Liber*; *de Sphæra Liber*; *de Informatione Episcoporum Sermo*; and an Epigram; besides several pieces never published. The life of St. Adalbert, archbishop of Prague, formerly ascribed to him, is supposed not to be his. But the Tract *de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, formerly ascribed to Heriger, abbot of Laubes, is supposed to have been the production of Gerbert. *Tr.*—For his Epistles as pope, see Jaffé, 345. *Ed.*]

¹ See Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* i. 314,

who were illiterate, stupid, ignorant of everything pertaining to religion, libidinous, superstitious, and flagitious.¹ Nor can anyone doubt, that those who wished to be regarded as the fathers and guardians of the universal church, were the principal causes of these evils. Nothing certainly can be thought of, so filthy, criminal, and wicked, as to be deemed incompatible with their characters by the supreme directors of religion and its rites; nor was any government ever so loaded with vices of every kind, as that which passed for the most holy.² What the Greek pontiffs were, the single example of *Theophylact* shows; who, as credible historians testify, made traffic of everything sacred, and cared for nothing but his hounds and his horses.³ But though the Greek patriarchs were very unworthy men, yet they possessed more dignity and virtue than the Roman pontiffs.

§ 2. That the history of the Roman bishops in this century is a history not of men, but of monsters, a history of the most atrocious villanies and crimes, is acknowledged by all the best writers; those not excepted even who plead for pontifical authority.⁴ The principal cause of these enormities is to be sought for in the calamities of the times, which ensued upon the extinction of the family of *Charles* the

¹ [Ratherius in his *Volumen Perpendiculorum, sive de contemptu canonum*, for instance, speaks of a clergyman, 'Qui cum omnes mulieres diocesis suæ sint ipsius filie spirituales, ejuslibet forte illarum corruptione pollutus est.' He tells us, that the nobility were more anxious to become bishops than to serve the Lord; and that the example of the light-minded bishops, who would recite passages of the Bible, such as John x. 1, with laughter, led others to indulge in similar levity. See Semler's Continuation of Baumgarten's *Kirchenhistorie*, iv. 507. *Schl.*]

² [The reader is referred to the testimony of Lewis Ant. Muratori, in his *Antiqq. Ital. Medii Ævi*, l. v. p. 82. 'In the tenth century, especially, alas! what unheard-of monsters filled not only many of the chairs of bishops and abbots, but likewise that of St. Peter! Everywhere might be seen the profligate morals of the clergy and monks; and not a few of the rulers of churches were more worthy of the appellation of wolves than of pastors.'—'Good theologians were then not to be found.' *Schl.*]

³ [This prelate, who was of royal blood, was possessor of the see of Constantinople at the age of sixteen. While under his tutors, he appeared grave and decent; but when arrived at maturity, he became luxurious and extravagant. He sold ecclesiastical offices; and he was so attached to horses and to hunting, that he kept more than 2,000 horses, which he fed on nuts and fruits steeped in odorous wine. Once, while celebrating mass, his groom brought him intelligence that his favourite mare had foaled. His joy was so great, that, suspending the

service, he ran to the stable, and, after viewing the foal, returned to the great temple, and completed the sacred services. His death, which happened A.D. 956, after he had been bishop twenty-three years, was occasioned by his being thrown from his horse against a wall. This brought on a spitting of blood; he languished two years, but without becoming more devout, and then died of a dropsy. Thus Fleury, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, l. lv. sec. 51. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Baronius, *Annales*, ad ann. 900, says of this century, 'It is usual to denominate it the *iron age*, on account of its barbarism and barrenness of all good; also the *leadén age*, on account of the abounding wickedness by which it was deformed; and the *dark age*, on account of the scarcity of writers.'—'One can scarcely believe, nay, absolutely cannot credit, without ocular demonstration, what unworthy conduct, what base and enormous deeds, what execrable and abominable transactions, disgraced the holy catholic see, which is the pivot on which the whole catholic church revolves; when temporal princes, who, though called Christians, were most cruel tyrants, arrogated to themselves the election of the Roman pontiffs. Alas, the shame! Alas, the mischief! What monsters, horrible to behold, were then raised to the holy see, which angels revere! What evils did they perpetrate; what horrible tragedies ensued! With what pollutions was this see, though itself without spot or wrinkle, then stained; what corruptions infected it; what filthiness defiled it; and hence what marks of perpetual infamy are visible upon it!' *Tr.*]

Great, in the greater part of Europe, but especially in Italy. Upon the death of *Benedict IV.*, A.D. 903, *Leo V.* was elected his successor. But he reigned only forty days; when *Christophanus*,¹ cardinal of St. Laurence, dethroned him, and cast him into prison. In the following year, *Sergius III.*, a Roman presbyter, stripped *Christophanus* of the pontifical dignity, by the aid of *Adalbert*, the very powerful marquess of Tuscany, who controlled everything at Rome according to his pleasure. *Sergius* died in 911; and his successors, *Anastasius III.* and *Lando*, filled the holy office only for a short time, and performed nothing worthy of notice.

§ 3. After the death of *Lando*, A.D. 914, *Alberic*, the very rich and powerful marquess or count of Tusculum, found a successor for him, by the instigation of his mother-in-law, *Theodora*, a very lewd woman, who ruled everything at Rome, in *John X.*, then archbishop of Ravenna. For at this time nothing was conducted regularly at Rome, but everything was carried by bribery, or violence.² This *John*, though otherwise a very bad man, is commended for one deed: he successfully attacked and vanquished the Saracens, who occupied a fortified mountain [on the banks of the] *Garigliano*. But *Marozia*, the daughter of *Theodora* and wife of *Alberic*, was inimical to him. Therefore when she, on the death of her husband *Alberic*, had married *Wido* [or *Guilo*], marquess of Tuscany, she persuaded her new husband to seize her mother's lover, A.D. 928, and to imprison and kill him. *Leo VI.* now succeeded; and he dying six months after, was followed by *Stephen VII.* After two years, or A.D. 931, *Stephen* died, and *Marozia* bade her very youthful son, *John XI.* (whom she had by the Roman pontiff, *Sergius III.*), mount Peter's chair, and govern the church.³

¹ [Or *Christopher*. Tr.]

² [At that time the notorious *Theodora*, with her daughters, *Marozia* and *Theodora*, resided at Rome. They were wholly devoted to what was called the Tuscan party, of which the marquess *Adalbert* was the head. These women not only lived in habits of the most abominable unchastity, with the chief men of Rome, but they had boundless influence in the government there. Luitprand is, in this matter, the principal historian. Eccard and Muratori have indeed questioned his authority, and endeavoured to make his testimony suspicious. But *Sigebert* of Gemblours, and *Alberic*, the author of the chronicle of *Farfa* (who could not have transcribed from Luitprand), confirm his account of the profligate lives of these base females. *Schl.*—Luitprand's narrative of the elevation of *John X.*, as translated by Bower (*Lives of the Popes*, v. 90), is as follows:—'In those days, Peter, archbishop of Ravenna (esteemed the first archiepiscopal see after that of Rome), used frequently to send to Rome a deacon named *John*, to pay his obeisance to his holiness. As the deacon was a very comely and person-

able man, *Theodora*, falling passionately in love with him, engaged him in a criminal intrigue with her. While they lived thus together, the bishop of Bologna died, and *John* had interest enough to get himself elected in his room. But the archbishop of Ravenna dying before he was consecrated, *Theodora* persuaded him to exchange the see of Bologna for that of Ravenna; and he was accordingly, at her request, ordained, by pope *Lando*, archbishop of that city. *Lando* died soon after, and upon his death, *Theodora*, exerting all her interest, as she could not live at the distance of two hundred miles from her lover, got him preferred to the pontifical chair.'—Luitprand, l. ii. c. 13. See also *Fleury*, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, livre liv. § 49. Tr.]

³ *Marozia* is a woman infamous in the view of all historians, ancient and modern; who tell us, that the pontiff *John XI.* was her son, and the fruit of an illicit intercourse with *Sergius III.* Yet one writer, *Jo. Geo. Eccard*, in his *Origines Guelfice*, t. i. l. ii. p. 131, dares to vindicate her character, and to represent *Sergius* as being her first husband. I say *dares*, for it is

§ 4. *John XI.*, who was raised to supreme power in the church by the aid of his mother, lost it again, in the year 933, through the enmity of *Alberic*, his uterine brother. For *Alberic*, being offended with his step-father, *Hugo*, king of Italy, to whom *Marozia* was married after the death of *Wido*, expelled *Hugo* from Rome, and confined both his mother, and his brother the pontiff, in a prison, where *John* died, A.D. 936. The four pontiffs, who succeeded him in the government of the church, till the year 956, namely, *Leo VII.*, *Stephen VIII.*, *Marinus II.*, and *Agapetus*, are represented as better men than *John*; and it is certain that they reigned rather more tranquilly. But on the death of *Agapetus*, A.D. 956, *Alberic II.*, the consul of Rome, who controlled everything there by his influence and wealth, raised his own son *Octavian*, yet a youth, to the pontificate. He was quite unworthy of so great an office, which was filled by him under the name of *John XII.* Thereupon was introduced the custom of assuming a different name, which the Roman prelates, on their election, keep up to our times.¹

§ 5. The end of *John XII.* was as unfortunate as his promotion had been scandalous. Being very uneasy under the haughty government of *Berengarius II.*, king of Italy, he sent ambassadors to *Otto* the Great, king of Germany, A.D. 960, inviting him to march an army into Italy, and rescue the church and the commonwealth from cruel tyranny; and promised, if he would do this, to invest him with the insignia, and confer on him the title of emperor of the Romans. *Otto* came accordingly, with his forces, and was declared emperor of Rome, by *John*, in the year 962. But the pontiff soon after repented of his act; and although bound by a solemn oath to the emperor, he formed a coalition against him with *Adalbert*, the son of *Berengarius*. The emperor therefore returned to Rome the next year, and assembled a council, in which *John* was accused of numerous crimes, perhaps also proved guilty, and formally deposed; *Leo VIII.* being appointed to his place.² When *Otto* had left the city, *John* came to

audacious to acquit, without proof or reason, a woman whose actions condemn her, and show her to be destitute of all integrity and virtue.

¹ [Mosheim is incorrect in asserting that Alberic himself raised his son to the pontificate. This patrician and prince of Rome was in fact a tyrant, who had irregularly usurped the supremacy; but he died in 954, while Agapetus was living; so that he transmitted to his son only what he himself possessed — the civil dominion of the city. On the death of Agapetus, in 956, Octavian was advised by his friends to place himself in St. Peter's chair; and this he found not difficult to accomplish, although his age rendered him unfit for the place: for he was, perhaps, not then nineteen years old. He was the first pope, so far as is known, that changed his name. Yet it was only in spiritual affairs that he assumed the name

of John; in all worldly matters he still retained his former name. See Muratori, ad ann. 954 and 956. *Schl.* — According to Dr. Wiseman, *Last Four Popes*, p. 223, the pope, in the originals of bulls, signs his original name, though in all public documents his new name appears. *Ed.*]

² [The charges against John XII. were, that he had said mass without communicating; that he had ordained a deacon in a stable; that he had taken money for ordinations; and had ordained, as a bishop, a child only ten years old; that he carried on amours with various females, one of whom had been his father's concubine; that he turned the holy palace into a brothel; that he was given to hunting; that he had put out the eyes of his godfather, and had castrated one of the cardinals; that he had set several houses on fire, and had frequently been seen clad in armour, with a sword by

Rome, A.D. 964, assembled another council, and condemned the emperor's pontiff; but he soon after died a miserable death.¹ After his decease, the Romans elected *Benedict V.*; but the emperor carried him away into Germany, and he died at Hamburg.²

§ 6. The Roman pontiffs after *Leo VIII.*, who died A.D. 965, down to *Gerbert* or *Sylvester II.*, at the end of the century, were in different degrees meritorious and successful; but no one of them deserved high commendation. *John XIII.* was placed in the chair of St. Peter, by the influence of *Otto* the Great, A.D. 965. But when just entered upon his functions, he was driven from Rome. In the next year, however, the emperor came into Italy, and restored him to his chair, which he held peaceably till his death, in 972. His successor, *Benedict VI.*, was miserably strangled in a prison, into which he had been thrown, in the year 974, by *Crescentius*, the son of the very noted *Theodora*. For upon the death of *Otto* the Great, A.D. 973, the Romans, who had been awed by his power and severity, relapsed into their former licentiousness and disorderly violence. After *Benedict*, *Franco* a Roman, who assumed the name of *Boniface VII.*, held the pontifical chair, though but a short time only; for at the end of a month he was driven from Rome, and *Donus II.*, of whom nothing is known but his name, succeeded to the chair. *Donus* died in 975, and *Benedict VII.* governed the Roman church very quietly during nine years, or till A.D. 984. His prosperous reign was, probably, to be ascribed wholly to the wealth and influence of the family from which he originated. For he was the grandson of that *Alberic* who had been so powerful a prince, or tyrant rather, at Rome.

§ 7. His successor, *John XIV.*, previously bishop of Pavia, was destitute of the support derived from family, and was abandoned by *Otto III.*, by whose influence he had been elected. Hence his end was tragical; for *Boniface VII.*, who had thrust himself into the see of Rome in the year 974, and being soon after expelled, had retired to Constantinople, now returned to Rome, cast *John* into prison, and there despatched him. Yet *Boniface's* prosperity was of short duration, for he died but six months after. He was succeeded by *John XV.*, who by many is denominated *John XVI.*, on account of another *John*, whom they will have to have reigned at Rome four months. This *John XV.* or *XVI.* governed the church, during almost

his side; that he had drunken to the health of the devil; that in playing at dice, he had invoked Jupiter, Venus, and other pagan deities; that he never said matins, or any other canonical hours, and never signed himself with the sign of the cross. See *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, v. 108, 109. *Tr.*]

¹ [On a certain evening he retired out of the city to spend the night in criminal converse with a married woman. There he received a wound, perhaps from the injured husband, of which he died eight days after. Fleury, *Hist. Ecclési.* l. lvi. § 10, on the authority of Luitprand. *Tr.*]

² In this history of the pontiffs of this

century, I have consulted the original authorities, most of which are given by Muratori, in his *Scriptores Rerum Italicar.*; and I have also examined the writings of others, who have consulted the sources of information, namely, Baronius, Peter de Marca, Sigonius, *de Regno Italiae*, with the learned notes of Jos. Anton. Saxius, Muratori's *Annales Italiae*, Pagi, and others. The general correctness of these statements no one can doubt; yet many parts of this history undoubtedly need more light; and that it may have been corrupted by the partialities of the writers on whom we have to depend, cannot be denied.

eleven years, from A.D. 985 to 996, with as much prosperity as the troubled state of the Roman affairs would permit; which was owing, not so much to his personal virtues and prudence, as to his Roman birth, and to the family from which he sprang. Of course, his German successor, *Gregory V.*, whom the emperor *Otto III.* commanded the Romans to elect A.D. 996, was not equally prosperous. For the Roman consul *Crescens* expelled him the city; and placed *John XVI.*, who before was called *Philagathus*, at the head of the church. But *Otto III.*, returning to Italy, A.D. 998, with an army, deprived *John* of his eyes, his nose, and his ears; and, committing him to prison, restored *Gregory* to the chair. And *Gregory* dying soon after, the emperor raised his preceptor and friend, the celebrated *Gerbert* or *Sylvester II.*, to the chair of St. Peter, with the approbation of the Romans.¹

§ 8. Still, amidst these perpetual commotions, and the reiterated crimes and contests of those who called themselves Christ's vicegerents on earth, so great was the force of ignorance and superstition in those times, the power and influence of the Roman pontiffs were gradually and imperceptibly advanced.² *Otto* the Great, indeed, introduced a law, that no Roman pontiff should be created without the knowledge and consent of the emperor; and this regulation continued, as all admit, from his time to the end of the century. And this emperor, as well as his son and grandson of the same name, held uniformly their right of supremacy over the city of Rome and its territory, as well as over the Roman pontiff; as is demonstrable by many examples. And the more intelligent bishops likewise, of France, Germany, and Italy, throughout the century, were on their

¹ The history of the Roman pontiffs of this period is very barren and uninteresting; and besides, is involved in considerable uncertainty. I have followed, for the most part, Ludov. Ant. Muratori's *Annales Italice*, and Daniel Papebroch's *Conatus Chronologico-Historicus de Romanis Pontificibus*, which is prefixed to his *Acta Sanctorum Maii*.

² [Yet no traces of any dominion of the popes over the monasteries are as yet discoverable. In 968, the monastery of St. Gall was visited by imperial commissioners. The abbot of Reichenau had complained of the monks there, to Hedwig, the widowed duchess of Suabia; and through her the complaint reached the imperial court. The emperor appointed for this visitation eight bishops, of whom Henry of Treves was the first commissioner, together with eight abbots; and he commanded the commissioner to proceed mildly with the abbot of St. Gall, who was his kinsman. Here is no shadow of papal jurisdiction. (See Ekkehard, *de Casibus S. Galli*, cap. xi.) Yet the popes laid hold of various occasions to extend their power over monasteries. Thus we read of Sylvester II., that he arbitrarily

declared the monastery of Lorschheim free from other jurisdiction; and ordered, that whenever the monks deviated from their rule, they should be corrected by the Roman pontiff; and if this was not effectual, the emperor should be called upon (*regie potestati deputarentur*). See Mabillon, *Annales Ord. S. Bened.* sæcul. v. p. 43.—So also, in 973, the pope called the monastery of Corvey, whose privileges had been established by the emperor Otto, a daughter of the apostolic see, and subject only to it. The great lords, in the mean time, exercised sovereign power in ecclesiastical things, unrestrained, in Spain, in Germany, in England, in Italy, in Hungary, &c. The German churches possessed also the right of electing their own bishops; and the popes acknowledged the right of the German kings to give investiture to the bishops. See Harduin's *Concilia*, t. vi. pt. i. p. 153, &c., where pope John X. says explicitly, '*Cum prisca consuetudo vigeat, ut nullus alicui clerico episcopatum conferre debeat, nisi rex, cui divinitus sceptrum collatum est—hoc nullo modo esse potest, ut absque regali præceptione in qualibet parochia Episcopus sit consecratus.*' *Schl.*]

guard, to prevent the Roman bishop from arrogating to himself alone legislative power in the church. But nevertheless, the pontiffs, sometimes openly and directly, and sometimes by stratagems, invaded the rights both of emperors and kings, and also of the bishops;¹ nor were there wanting among the bishops those who flattered them and favoured their designs. It has been observed by learned men, that there were bishops in this century, though never before, who called the pontiffs *bishops of the world*, instead of bishops of Rome;² and that some even among the French clergy conceded, what had never been heard of, that *bishops receive indeed all their power from God, but through St. Peter*.³

§ 9. The inferior bishops eagerly took example from the principal bishop, in labouring to extend their authority. From the times of *Charles the Great* and his sons, many bishops and abbots had obtained, for their tenants and estates, exemption from the jurisdiction of the counts and other magistrates, and also from all imposts and taxes. But in this century they sought also to obtain civil jurisdiction over the cities and districts subject to them, and coveted the functions of dukes, marquesses, and counts.⁴ For whereas violent contests, respecting jurisdiction and other things, frequently sprang up between the dukes, the governors of cities, or the counts and marquesses, on the one hand, and the bishops on the other, these latter, taking advantage of favourable occasions, left no means unattempted to secure to themselves those high offices, and the kings and emperors not unfrequently granted their petitions; sometimes in order to put an end to the contentions and broils among the civil and military magistrates, sometimes from their reverence for religion, and sometimes with a view to augment their own power by means of the bishops. And hence it was, that from this time onward so many bishops and abbots were to be seen sustaining also characters entirely foreign from their sacred functions, and enjoying the rank of dukes, marquesses, counts, and viscounts.⁵

¹ Examples are adduced in the *Hist. du Droit Ecclésiastique François*, i. 217, ed. in 8vo.

² *Non urbis, sed orbis episcopos.*

³ The Benedictine monks, in *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 78, 79, 98, 186, &c.

⁴ [Among these, may be reckoned the regulation of tolls and coinage, which some of them obtained. Thus, for example, the archbishopric of Treves obtained these rights from king Lewis, A.D. 902. See Brouwer's *Annal. Trevir.* l. ix. and Köhler's *Reichshistorie*, p. 54.—And in 946, the emperor Otto bestowed on the monastery of Gemblours the control of the market and of coinage, the free election of their own abbots and advocates, and the right of erecting fortifications. See Mabillon, *Annal. Ord. S. Bened.* iii. 485, 486. In like manner, Otto II. conferred on Milo, bishop of Minden, the right of coining money. *Chron. Episcop.*

Mindens. p. 166, 167, in Leibnitz's *Scriptores Brunsw.* t. ii. And likewise Adalgag, archbishop of Hamburg, received from the munificence of Otto great power, and direct civil dominion, namely, the judicial power, the right to levy tolls and to coin money, and, in short, whatever related to the royal finance, to the exclusion of all royal functionaries from these affairs. See Lambecius, *Orig. Hamburg.* p. 10, 11. Pagi, *Crit. ad Baron. Annal.* ann. 988, § 1, 2. Schl.—Pagi also tells us (from Witichind, l. i. and the *Chron. Belgic. Magn.*) that similar powers were granted by Otto I. to the archbishopric of Cologne and Mentz, and to the bishopric of Spire and Minden. He adds, however, that it was not lawful for bishops to preside *personally* in the temporal courts; but only by their deputies. *Tr.*]

⁵ Ludov. Thomassin, in his *Disciplina Ecclesiæ vetus et nova*, t. iii. l. i. c. 28, p. 89,

§ 10. Besides their ignorance, which was extreme,¹ the body of the Latin clergy were chargeable with two great vices, which are deplored by most of the writers of those times; namely, *concubinage* and *simony*. In the first place, very generally, not only the priests, but the monks also, connected themselves with women, some indeed in a lawful way, but others in an unlawful one; and with these wives and concubines, and the children born of them, they squandered the property of the church.² In the next place, there was scarcely any such thing as the regular and canonical *election* of bishops and abbots; but the kings, princes, and nobles, either conferred the sacred offices on their friends and ministers, for whom they had partiality, or *sold* them to the highest bidders.³ And hence, frequently, men the most unfit and flagitious, sometimes soldiers, civil magistrates, and counts, were invested with spiritual offices of the highest dignity and influence. In the following century *Gregory VII.* endeavoured to cure both of these evils.

§ 11. Among the Greek and Oriental monks there was more appearance of religion and decorum; but among the Latin monks, at the beginning of this century, discipline was so low, that most of them did not know the very name of St. Benedict's rule, although they were under an obligation to live by it. To this evil a remedy, not altogether unsuccessful, was applied by *Odo*, a French nobleman, who was a learned and devout man, according to the standard of that age. Being made abbot of *Cluny* in Burgundy, a province of France, after the death of *Berno*, A.D. 927, he not only obliged his monks to live according to their rule, but likewise bound them to observe additional rites and regulations, which had an air of sanctity, but were in reality trivial, though onerous and inconvenient.⁴ This new form of monastic life procured for its author great fame and honour, and in a short time it was propagated over all Europe. For very many of the ancient monasteries in France, Germany, Italy,

has collected much matter in order to evince that the functions of dukes and counts were sustained by bishops as early as the *ninth* century. And some of the bishops pretend to trace the origin of their secular power back to the *eighth* century. But I greatly mistake, if any indubitable instance can be produced of earlier date than the *tenth* century.

¹ RATHERIUS, in his *Itinerarium* (published by D'Achery, *Spicileg.* i. 381), says of the priests of Verona, *sciscitatus de fide illorum, inveni plurimos neque ipsum sapere symbolum, qui fuisse creditur Apostolorum.*

² That this custom commenced in the beginning of this century, appears from Orderic Vitalis and others, and particularly from an epistle of Manto, bishop of Châlons, published by Jo. Mabillon, *Analecta Veter.* p. 429, ed. nova. Of the Italian monks, who supported wives and concubines, and thus misused the church property, see Hugo, *de*

Monasterii Farfensis Destructione; in Muratori's *Antiq. Ital. Medii Ævi*, vi. 278, &c.

³ Very noticeable examples and testimonies may be seen in the *Gallia Christiana*, i. 23, 37; ii. 173, 179. See also Abbo's *Apologeticus*, subjoined to the *Codex Canon.* Pitheci, p. 398, and Mabillon, *Annales Bened.* t. v. and others.

⁴ See Jo. Mabillon, *Annales Bened.* iii. 386, &c., and *Prefatio ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* sæcul. v. p. xxvi. &c. Mabillon treats largely of Berno, the first abbot of Cluny, and the founder of the order of Cluny, in his *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* sec. v. p. 66, and of Odo, *ibid.* p. 122, &c. The general history of the order of Cluny is neatly written by Hipp. Helyot, *Histoire des Ordres Religieuses*, vi. 184, &c. The present state of Cluny is described by Martene, *Voyage Littér. de deux Bénédictins*, pt. i. p. 227, &c.

Britain, and Spain, adopted the discipline of Cluny; and the new monasteries that were erected, were, by their founders, subjected to the same discipline. Thus was formed, in the next century, the venerable *order of Cluny*, or that body of associated Cluniacs which was very widely extended and renowned for its wealth and power.¹

§ 12. The more distinguished writers of this century are easily enumerated. Among the Greeks was *Simeon Magister*, chancellor of Constantinople. He transcribed the earlier-written *lives of the Saints*, for the sake of giving them a better form, and clothing them in a better style; for which he obtained the surname of *Metaphrastes*.² But in digesting, polishing, and embellishing these lives of Saints, he is said to have enlarged the original narratives by the addition of many of his own fictions and silly tales. *Nicon*, an Armenian monk, has left us a tract on the religion of the Armenians, which is not contemptible.³ The two authors of *Catena*, *Olympiodorus*, and *Æcumenius*,⁴ are placed by some in this century; but it

¹ I am mistaken if most of the writers on ecclesiastical history have not misapprehended the import of the word *order*, as applied to the Cluniacensians, Cistercians, and others. For they take it to mean a new monastic *institute*, or a new *sect* of monks; in which they mistake by confounding the modern use of the term with its ancient meaning. The term *order*, as used by the writers of that age, at first signified merely some particular *form of monastic discipline*. But from this use of the word, another gradually arose, for the word *order* denoted a *society* or association of many monasteries, acknowledging one head, and following the same rules of life. The *order of Cluny* was not a new monastic *sect*, like the orders of *Carthusians*, *Dominicans*, and *Franciscans*; but it denoted, first, that mode of living which Odo prescribed to the Benedictine monks of Cluny; and then the whole number of monasteries in different parts of Europe, which embraced the regulations of Cluny, and united in a kind of association, of which the abbot of Cluny in France was the head.

² See Leo Allatius, *de Symeonum Scriptis*, p. 24, &c. Jo. Bolland, *Præfatio ad Acta Sanctorum*, Antw. § iii. p. vi. &c. [Simeon Metaphrastes was of noble birth, and a man of both genius and learning. The emperor Leo made him his principal secretary, patrician, logothetes or high chancellor, and master of the palace. He flourished about 901; and devoted his time, when the business of his offices did not prevent, to the re-writing of the lives of the saints. How many narratives he revised, or composed anew, it is difficult to state; because the religious biographies of subsequent writers have been ascribed to him. Of the 661 narratives, long and short, which have been

attributed to him, Leo Allatius supposes 122 are actually of his revision; 444 he attributes to other authors, whom he names; and 95, he thinks, are not Simeon's, but he cannot ascertain to whom they should be attributed.—Many of the genuine narratives of Simeon have found their way into the large collections of Surius and Bolland; but the greater part of the whole were never printed.—Besides these revised biographies, a number of orations, epistles, and short poems, hymns, &c., are extant as the productions of Simeon. See Cave's *Hist. Litt.* t. ii. and Fleury, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, l. lv. § 31. *Tr.*]

³ [Nicon was born in Pontus, and educated in a monastery on the confines of Pontus and Paphlagonia. About 961, his abbot sent him out as a missionary; and he travelled in Armenia, and various countries of the East, and in Greece. He was accounted a saint; and miracles are related of him. His book *de pessima Religione Armenorum*, in a Latin translation, is extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. *Tr.*]

⁴ For an account of Æcumenius of Tricca, see especially Bernh. de Montfaucon, *Biblioth. Græc.* p. 274. [Æcumenius, bishop of Tricca in Thrace, is placed in this century, because he quotes Photius who lived in the ninth century, but mentions no later writer. His brief Scholia on the Acts of the Apostles and on the canonical Epistles, are all borrowed from the fathers, and especially from Chrysostom. His works were printed at Paris, Gr. and Lat., 1631, two tom. fol.—Olympiodorus, a Greek monk, and a deacon of Alexandria, of uncertain age, is author of an exposition of the book of Ecclesiastes; printed, Gr. and Lat., in the *Auctuarium Patr. Duccanum*, ii. 602. The *Catena* on Job, ascribed to him,

is wholly on conjectural grounds. With better reason *Suidas*, the famous lexicographer, is placed among the writers of this century.¹ The most distinguished author among the Arabian Christians was *Eutychius*, bishop of Alexandria, whose *Annales*, with other writings, are still extant.²

§ 13. The best among the Latin writers was *Gerbert*, or *Sylvester II.*, the Roman pontiff, of whom we have spoken before.³ The rest deserve no higher character than that of indifferent writers. *Odo*, who laid the foundation of the Cluniac association or order, has left some writings, which have few marks of genius and discernment, but many of superstition.⁴ Some tracts of *Ratherius* of Verona are extant; which indicate a mind of good powers, and imbued with the love of justice and integrity.⁵ *Atto* of Vercelli composed a tract on

is more probably the work of Nicetas, in the middle of the next century. It was published, Gr. and Lat., by Patr. Junius, Lond. 1637. fol. Tr.]

¹ [That *Suidas* lived in the latter part of this century, is inferred from his computations in the article 'Ἀδδμ, which all terminate with the reign of the emperor John Zimisces, who died of poison, A.D. 975. His Dictionary, which is a kind of historical and literary *Encyclopædia*, was best published by Kuster, Cambridge, 1705, 3 vols. fol. Tr.]

² See Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliographia Antiquaria*, p. 179; and Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 347. [*Eutychius* was a native of Egypt, and the Melchite or orthodox patriarch of Alexandria, from 933 to 950. His Arabic name was Said Ibn Batrik, that is, Said the son of Batrik. Said signifies *Blessed*; which in Greek is *Εὐτυχὴς* or *Eutychius*. He lived unhappily with his flock, and died at the age of 75. His principal work is his *Annals*, from the creation to A.D. 937; edited by E. Pocock, Arab. and Lat. Oxford, 1658, 4to. He also wrote a history of Sicily, after its conquest by the Saracens; a disputation between the heterodox and Christians, in opposition to the Jacobites; and some medical tracts; all of which still exist in manuscript.

The *Greek writers* of this century, omitted by Mosheim, are the following:—

John Cameniata, a reader in the church of Thessalonica. When that city was taken and plundered by the Saracens, A.D. 904, John was made prisoner, and carried to Tarsus, where he composed a full and interesting *History of the destruction of Thessalonica*, and of his own sufferings. It was published, Gr. and Lat., by Leo Allatius, *Symmict.* pt. ii. p. 180.

Hippolytus of Thebes, who has been confounded with Hippolytus of Portus, of the third century. He flourished about 933.

A *Chronicon*, or a part of one, composed by him, was published, Gr. and Lat., by H. Canisius, *Lectio. Antig.* iii. 35. He also, it is probable, composed the brief notices of the twelve apostles, which have gone under the name of the earlier Hippolytus.

Moses Bar-Cepha, bishop of Beth-Raman, and supervisor of the churches in the regions of Babylonia. He lived in this century, but in what part of it is uncertain. He composed, in Syriac, three books of *Paradiso*; which Andr. Masius translated into Latin, and then published his translation, Antw. 1568, 8vo. It is also in the *Biblioth. Patr.* xvii. 456.

Sisinnius, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 994—997, composed a tract *de Nuptiis Consobrinorum*; which is in Leunclavius, *Jus Gr. et Rom.* l. iii. p. 197. Tr.]

³ [See the preceding chapter, § 7, 8, and Note.]

⁴ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 229. [His life, written by John, one of his intimate friends, in three books, and the same revised by Nalgod, two centuries after, are in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor.* vii. or *Sæcul.* v. p. 150—199; to which Mabillon prefixes a full account, composed by himself; *ibid.* p. 124, &c. He was a Frenchman, brought up in the court of William duke of Aquitaine, and educated at Tours and Paris. He early became a monk, and a great admirer of St. Martin of Tours. From 912, till his death in 942, he was engaged in teaching schools, presiding in monasteries, making journeys to Rome and Paris, &c., on public business. His works are several legends, concerning St. Martin, St. Mary Magdalen, &c.; a life of St. Gerald, count of Orleans; an abridgment of Gregory's *Morals* on Job, in 25 books; and devotional pieces. They are all published in the *Biblioth. Patr.* t. xvii. Tr.—See Maitland, *Dark Ages*, p. 297. Ed.]

⁵ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 339. [See note on the preceding chapter, § 7. Tr.]

ecclesiastical grievances, which throws light on the state of those times.¹ *Dunstan*, an Englishman, compiled, for the benefit of monks, a *Harmony of monastic rules*.² *Ælfrie* of Canterbury deserved well of the Anglo-Saxons in Britain by a variety of tracts.³ *Burchard*, bishop of Worms, aided the study of canon law by a volume of *Decreta*, in twenty books. But he was not the sole compiler, for he was aided by *Olbert*.⁴ *Odilo*⁵ of Lyons has

¹ *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 281. [Atto Secundus was a native of Lombardy, a man of learning and virtue, according to the standard of the age. Augustine was his favourite author. He presided over the church of Vercelli, from 945, till his death in 960. His works were republished, more complete, in 2 vols. fol. Vercelli, 1769. They comprise a collection of canons and ecclesiastical statutes, for the use of his church; *de Pressuris Ecclesiasticis*, in three parts; and the bishop's courts, their ordinations; and *de Facultatibus Ecclesiarum*; several Homilies; and a verbal Commentary on the Epistles of Paul. *Tr.*]

² [St. Dunstan was born in Somerset, educated at Glastonbury, where he became a monk, and afterwards abbot. He served several years at court, was bishop of Worcester A. D. 957, bishop of London in 959, and archbishop of Canterbury from 960 to 988. He was a most zealous promoter of monkery and celibacy, and is reported to have wrought many miracles. His *Harmony* of monastic rules, in twelve chapters, was published by Reiner, as an Appendix to his work on the antiquity of the Benedictine order in England, Duaci, 1626, fol. See Hume's *History of England*, v. i. c. ii. p. 94, &c. His life and miracles composed by Osbern, a monk of Canterbury in the eleventh century, with extracts from others, may be seen in Mabillon, *Acta SS. vii. or Sæcul. v. p. 654—715. Tr.*]

³ [Ælfrie, or Elfric, or Alfric, archbishop of Canterbury, from A. D. 996 to 1006, was a monk of Abingdon, and (as Ussher supposes) filled several other offices in the church, during forty years, before he was made archbishop of Canterbury. Most of the writings generally ascribed to him, are by some ascribed to another monk of the same name, who was made archbishop of York, and died A. D. 1051. See Henry Wharton's *Dissert. de Duobus Elfricis* in his *Anglia Sacra*; and Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. viii. 61, &c.* The works ascribed to Ælfrie of Canterbury, are a Biblical History; a Homily on the body and blood of Christ (in which he disproves transubstantiation); an Epistle to Wulfstan, bishop of Sherborne, another to Wulfstan, archbishop of York; a Penitentiary; and an Epistle to Wulfstan, on the ecclesias-

tical canons. These have been published; and most of them in Saxon and Latin. Besides these, there exist in MSS. a collection of eighty Sermons; a Saxon Chronicle, a translation of the canons of the Nicene council, a translation of St. Gregory's Dialogue, with several lives of monkish saints, all in the Saxon language; also a Latin-Saxon dictionary, a grammar of the Saxon language; Extracts from Priscian, &c. See Cave's *Hist. Litt. t. ii. Tr.*—There is little probability that any of the works under the name of Elfric were written by the archbishop of Canterbury of that name. Wharton, therefore, had great reason to ascribe them to Elfric of York. They are, in fact, a very important mass of writings both on account of the language and the doctrine. Upon the pen to which we owe them there is great room for controversy, as may be seen in Mr. Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*. Part of Elfric's Homilies are published by the 'Elfric society.' S.]

⁴ See the *Chronicon Wormatiense*, in Ludewig's *Reliquiæ Manuscriptor. ii. 43*; and the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii. 595, &c. [Burchard, a Hessian, was first a monk of Laubes, and then bishop of Worms, from 996 to 1026. He began his great work on canon law, while in his monastery, and with the aid of his instructor Olbert; but completed it during his episcopate. It was first published at Cologne, 1548, fol., and afterwards in 8vo. Though still in twenty books, it contains not a sixth part of the original work. Its authority is very small, being compiled without due care, and often from spurious works. The full title of the book is, *Magnum Decretorum* (or *Canonum*) *Volumen*; but it is often cited by the title *Decretum*; and also by that of *Brocardica*, or *Brocardicorum Opus*, from the French and Italian *Brocard*, i. e. Burchard. See Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch. xxii. 414, &c. Tr.*]

⁵ [St. Odilo was a native of Auvergne, educated at Cluny, where he became the abbot A. D. 994. He afterwards refused the archbishopric of Lyons; and died abbot of Cluny A. D. 1049, aged 87 years. His works, as published by Du Chesne, in his *Biblioth. Cluniacensis*, Paris, 1614, and thence in the *Biblioth. Patr. t. xvii.* consist of 14 sermons

left us some frigid sermons, and other things not much better. Of those who wrote histories and annals, this is not the place to treat.¹

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

§ 1. The state of religion — § 2. Contests respecting predestination and the Lord's supper — § 3. Belief that the day of judgment was at hand — § 4. Multitude of the saints — § 5, 6. The different branches of theology neglected — § 7. Controversy between the Greeks and Latins.

§ 1. THAT the most important doctrines of Christianity were misunderstood and perverted, and that such doctrines as remained in their integrity and uncorrupted were obscured by most unfounded opinions, is manifest from every writer of this period. The essence of religion was thought, both by Greek and Latin, to consist in the worship of images, in honouring departed saints, in searching for and preserving relics, and in enriching priests and monks. Scarcely an individual ventured to approach God until interest had been duly sought with images and saints. In getting relics together, and seeking after them, all the world was busy even to insanity. Nor, if we may believe the monks, was anything scarcely more an object of God's care in that age, than showing the places, to snoring old women and shaven friars, in which the corpses of holy men were deposited. A fire that burns out stains left on souls freed from the body, all desperately feared; in fact, more vehemently than the very punishments of hell. For the latter, it was supposed, might be easily escaped, if people only died rich in the prayers and merits of the

on the festal days; a life of St. Maiolus; a life of St. Adeleidis; four hymns; and some letters. His own life, written by his pupil Jotsald, in two books, is given us by Mabillon, together with a long biographical preface, in the *Acta Sanctor.* viii. 631—710. *Tr.*]

¹ [The *Latin* writers omitted by Mosheim, were some of them mere authors of the lives of monks and saints. Such were Stephen, abbot of Laubes, and A.D. 903, bishop of Liege; Hubald, or Hucbald, a French monk, who flourished under Charles the Bald, and down to 916; Gerard, dean of St. Medard's, A.D. 932; — Fridegodus, a monk of Canterbury, A.D. 960; — and Adso, abbot of Montier-Ramey-en-Der, in France, A.D. 980. Most of the others were popes or bishops, who have left us only some epistles. Such were John X., pope 914—928; — Agapetus II., pope 946—955; — John XII., pope 955—963; — John XIII., pope 965—972; — Pilgrim, or Peregrine, archbishop of Lorch, 971—992; — Benedict VI., pope A.D.

972—974; — Benedict VII., pope A.D. 974—983; — John XV., pope A.D. 985—996; — and Gregory V., pope A.D. 996—999. To these classes of writers may be subjoined the two following individuals.

Roswida, or Roswitha, a learned and devout nun, of Gandersheim in Germany, flourished about 980. She understood Greek, as well as the Latin, in which she wrote. Her compositions are all in verse; namely, a panegyric on Otto the Great; eight Martyrdoms of early Saints; six sacred Comedies, on various subjects, but chiefly in praise of the saints; and a poem on the establishment of her monastery. These were best edited by H. L. Schurzfleisch, Wittemb. 1707, 4to. See Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch.* xxi. 177, 256.

Heriger, or Hariger, abbot of Laubes, A.D. 990—1007. He wrote a history of the bishops of Liege; a tract on the body and blood of Christ; and the lives of St. Ursmar, St. Berlendis, and St. Landoald. *Tr.*]

sacred order, or had some saint to intercede for them ; but not so the former. This dread was found so very advantageous to the priests, that they took care, by their discourses, fables, and fictitious miracles, to raise it continually higher and higher.

§ 2. The controversies respecting grace and the Lord's Supper, which disquieted the preceding century, were at rest in this. For each party, as appears from various testimonies, left the other at liberty, either to retain the sentiments which it had embraced, or to change them. Nor was it an object of much inquiry in this illiterate and thoughtless age, what the theologians believed on these and other subjects. Hence, among those who flourished in this age, we find both followers of *Augustine* and followers of *Pelagius* ; and perhaps as many can be discovered who supposed the body and blood of Christ to be truly and naturally presented in the Holy Supper, as of those who either had no definite and fixed opinion on the subject, or judged the Lord's body to be absent materially, and to be received in the eucharist only by some holy movement of the soul.¹ Let no one, however, ascribe this moderation and forbearance to the wisdom and virtue of the age : it was rather the want of intelligence and knowledge which rendered men both indisposed and unable to contend on these subjects.

§ 3. That an immense superstition had everywhere gained a vigorous hold over all the Christian world, appears from numberless testimonies and examples. To this were added many futile and groundless opinions, fostered by the priests for their own advantage. Among the opinions which dishonoured and disquieted the Latin churches in this century, none produced more excitement than the belief that the day of final consummation was at hand. This belief was derived, in the preceding century, from the Apocalypse of *John* xx. 2—4,² and being advanced by many in this century, it spread over all Europe, and excited incredible alarm among the people. For they supposed *St. John* to have explicitly foretold, that after a thousand years from the birth of *Christ*, Satan would be let loose, Antichrist would appear, and the end of the world would come. Hence immense numbers, transferring their property to the churches and monasteries, left all, and proceeded to Palestine, where they supposed *Christ* would descend from heaven to judge the world. Others, by a solemn vow

¹ That the Latin doctors of this century held different opinions respecting the manner in which the body and blood of Christ are present in the sacred Supper, is very clearly attested ; nor do the learned men among the Roman Catholics, who follow truth rather than party feelings, disavow the fact. That the doctrine of *transubstantiation* was at this time unknown to the English, has been shown from their public *homilies*, by Rapin de Thoyras, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, i. 463. Yet that this doctrine was then received by some of the French and German divines, may be as easily demonstrated. [‘For a judicious account of

the opinions of the Saxon English church concerning the Eucharist, see Collier's *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, vol. i. cent. x. p. 204, 266.’ *Macl.*]

² [‘And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a *thousand years*,’ &c. They understood this to refer to the times of the Christian dispensation. And as Satan was to be loosed after the thousand years, and as the vision proceeds immediately to describe the general judgment, they concluded the world would come to an end about A.D. 1000. *Tr.*]

consecrated themselves and all they possessed to the churches, the monasteries, and the priests; serving them in the character of slaves, and performing the daily tasks assigned them: for they hoped, that the supreme Judge would be more favourable to them, if they made themselves servants to *his* servants. Hence also, whenever an eclipse of the sun or moon took place, most people betook themselves to caverns, and rocks, and caves. Very many also gave a large part of their estates to God and the saints; that is, to the priests and monks. And in many places, edifices, both sacred and secular, were suffered to go to decay, and, in some instances, actually pulled down, from the expectation that they would no longer be needed. This general delusion was opposed, indeed, by a few wiser individuals; but nothing could overcome it, till the century had closed. But when the century ended without any great calamity, the greater part began to understand that *John* had not really predicted what they so much feared.¹

§ 4. A great multitude of saints, *i.e.* of nobles² of the heavenly court, and ministers of the heavenly commonwealth, sprang up everywhere.³ For this extremely inconsiderate and superstitious age required a host of patrons. Besides, so great was the wickedness and madness of most people, that the reputation of saintship could be gained without much effort. Whoever was rather austere and of

¹ Almost all the donations of this century afford evidence of this general delusion in Europe. For the reason assigned for the gift, is generally thus expressed: *Appropinquante mundi termino, &c.* [*i.e.* the end of the world being now at hand.] Of the many other proofs of the prevalence of this opinion (which was so profitable to the clergy), I will adduce only one striking passage, from Abbo of Fleury, in his *Apologeticus adversus Arnulphum*, which Fr. Pitheous has subjoined to the *Codex Canonum Ecclesie Romane*, p. 401. 'When quite a youth (in the tenth century), I heard a public discourse delivered in the church of Paris, concerning the end of the world; that immediately after the thousand years terminated, Antichrist would come, and not long after that, the universal judgment would follow. This doctrine I resisted, as far as I was able, from the Gospels, the Apocalypse, and the book of Daniel. At last, my abbot, of blessed memory, Richard, very skilfully repelled the error which insinuated itself respecting the end of the world, after receiving the letter from the Lorrainers which he commanded me to answer. For the rumour had filled nearly the whole world, that when our Lord's Annunciation should fall on Good Friday, then, beyond all doubt, the end of the world would take place.'

² Purpuratorum.

³ [Yet it should be remarked, that before

994, prayers to the saints and to the virgin Mary are not mentioned in the canons of the English church. They are first enjoined in a collection of canons attributed to this date, which is in Wilkins's *Concil.* i. 265. (And these are but a translation of uncertain date from the Capitula of Theodulf of Orleans, cir. 797. *Ed.*) We read, however, in a circular Epistle of John XV., in 993: *Sic adoramus et colimus reliquias martyrum et confessorum, ut eum (Christum), ejus martyres sunt, adoremus—siquis contradicat, Anathema.* Harduin's *Concil.* t. vi. pt. i. p. 726. *Schl.*—Invocation of the sainted dead crept into the church from an anterior habit of praying to God, that the suppliant might have the benefit of the prayers of these departed spirits. It is obvious, both that we have no scriptural authority for invoking the dead, but rather the reverse, and also, that we have no means of knowing whether they can hear our invocation. Thus, this usage required the preparation which it found, in an excessive veneration for certain eminent Christians, or ascetics, and a corresponding anxiety for the benefit of their prayers. At first, this anxiety was to be allayed by means of Omniscience itself; and a frame of mind was thus formed which naturally glided into some sort of notion that the departed spirit might have its own powers of hearing the suppliant, and that this latter was piously employed in making use of them. *S.*]

uncompromising manners, or had anything remarkable in his imaginative powers, passed among the guilty multitude for God's especial friend. The Roman pontiff, who had before begun to assume to himself the right of making new saints, gave the first specimen of the actual exercise of this power, in this century; at least, no example of an earlier date is extant. *John XV.*, in the year 993, by a solemn act, enrolled *Udalric*, bishop of Augsburg, among those to whom Christians might lawfully address prayers and worship.¹ Yet this act must not be understood to imply, that from this time onward, none but the Roman pontiff might enrol a saint.² For there are examples which show, that down to the twelfth century, the bishops of the higher ranks, and provincial councils, without even consulting the pontiff, did place in the list of saints, such as they deemed to be worthy of it.³ But in the twelfth century, *Alexander III.* annulled this right of councils and bishops; and made *canonisation*, as it is called, to rank among *the greater causes*, or such as belong only to the pontifical court.

§ 5. Upon the labours of theologians in sacred knowledge, and its different branches, little can be said. The Holy Scriptures no one explained in a manner that would place him high among even the lowest class of interpreters. For it is uncertain, whether *Olympiodorus* and *Ecumenius* of Tricca belong to this century. Among the Latins, *Remigius* of Auxerre continued his exposition of the Scriptures, which he began in the preceding century. He is very concise on the literal signification, but very copious and prolix on the mystical sense; which he prefers greatly to the literal meaning. Besides, he exhibits not so much his own thoughts, as those of others, deriving his explanations from the early interpreters. *Odo's Moralia* on Job are transcribed from the work of the same title by *Gregory the Great*. Who were esteemed the best expositors of Scripture in that age, may be learned from *Nothkerus Balbulus*,⁴ who wrote professedly an account of them.⁵

¹ Franc. Pagi, *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* ii. 259, &c.

² This opinion was held by the friends of the Roman court; and in particular, by Phil. Bonannus, *Numismat. Pontif. Romanor.* i. 41, &c.

³ See the remarks of Franc. Pagi, *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* ii. 260, iii. 30, and of Arm. De la Chapelle, *Bibliothèque Angloise*, x. 105, and Jo. Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæcul. v. Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* p. liii. [The word *canon*, in the middle ages, denoted in general, a *register* or a *matriculation roll*; and in a more limited sense, a *list of the saints*; and to *canonise* a person, was to enroll his name in this register of the saints. In the earlier times, none were recognised as saints, except martyrs and confessors. But in the times of ignorance, the stupid people often selected and made for themselves saints, who did not deserve the name. To remedy the evil, it was ordained that no

one should be recognised as a saint, till the bishop of the place, after investigation made, should declare him such. This was the practice in Europe, from the seventh century onward. The popes canonised, as well as others; but only in their own diocese. But at this time, the chapter of Augsburg saw fit to request the pope to pronounce their bishop Ulric a saint for all the churches. The bishop of Augsburg who succeeded Ulric, might have canonised this worthy man for the church of Augsburg; but in that case, he would have been honoured only in his own diocese, and not throughout the whole church. The pope complied with the request, without much inquiry. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Or the Stammerer. *Tr.*].

⁵ [His book is entitled, *de Interpretibus Divinarum Litterarum*; and may be found in *Pez's Thesaur. Anecd. Noviss.* t. i. pt. i. p. 1. It was addressed to Solomon, after-

§ 6. Systematic theology had not a single writer, Greek or Latin. The Greeks were satisfied with *Damascenus*; the Latins with *Augustine* and *Gregory the Great*, who were in that age regarded as the greatest of theologians. Yet some also read *Beale*, and *Rabanus Maurus*. Moral and practical theology received less attention than in almost any age. If we except some discourses, which are extremely meagre and dry, and the lives of saints, which were composed among the Greeks by *Simeon Metaphrastes*, and among the Latins by *Hubald*, *Odo*, *Stephen of Liege*, and others, without fidelity, and in very bad taste; there remains nothing more in this century, that can be placed under the head of practical theology. Nor do we find, that any one sought renown by polemic writings or confutations of the enemies of truth.

§ 7. The controversies between the Greeks and Latins, in consequence of the troubles and calamities of the times, were carried on with much less noise than before; but they were not wholly at rest.¹ And those certainly err very much, who maintain, that this pernicious discord was healed, and that the Greeks for a time came over to the Latins:² although it is true, that the state of the times obliged them occasionally to form a truce, though a deceptive one. The Greeks contended violently, among themselves, respecting repeated marriages. The emperor *Leo*, surnamed the *Wise*, or the *Philosopher*, having had no male issue by three successive wives, married a fourth, born in humble condition, *Zoë Carbinopsina*. As such marriages, by the canon law of the Greeks, were incestuous, the patriarch *Nicolaus* excluded the emperor from sacred rites. *Leo*, indignant at this, deprived *Nicolaus* of his office; and put *Euthymius* into his place, who admitted the emperor, indeed, to religious privileges, but resisted the law which he wished to enact, allowing fourth marriages. Hence a schism and great animosity arose among the clergy; some siding with *Nicolaus*, and others with *Euthymius*. *Leo* died soon after, and *Alexander* deposed *Euthymius*, and restored *Nicolaus* to his office; who now assailed the character of the deceased emperor with the severest maledictions and execrations; and defended his opinion upon the unlawfulness of fourth marriages in the most contentious manner. To put an end to these commotions, so dangerous to the Greeks, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, the son of *Leo*, assembled an ecclesiastical council, at Constantinople, in the year 920. This council prohibited fourth marriages altogether, but allowed third, under certain restrictions. The publication of this law restored the public tranquillity.³ Some other small contests, of similar

wards bishop of Constance, whom it excited to the study of the biblical interpreters, of the ecclesiastical historians, and the writers of biographies of the saints; so that it may be viewed as a guide to the best method of studying theology, agreeably to the taste of those times. *Schl.*]

¹ Mich. Le Quien, *Diss. i. Damascenica, de Processione Spiritus S.* § 13, p. 12. Fred. Spanheim, *de Perpetua Dissensione Ecclesie*

Orient. et Occident. pt. iv. § vii. *Opp.* ii. 529.

² Leo Allatius, *de Perpetua Consensione Ecclesie Orient. et Occident.* lib. ii. cap. vii. viii. p. 600, &c.

³ These facts are faithfully collected from Cedrenus, Leunclavius (*de Jure Græco-Rom.* i. 104, &c.), Leo Grammaticus, Simeon Logothetes, and other writers of Byzantine history.

importance, arose among the Greeks; which show their want of discernment, their ignorance of true religion, and how much the authority of those who lived in former times hindered them from exercising their own reason.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES AND RITES.

§ 1. The multitude of ceremonies—§ 2. Feast days—§ 3. Office of St. Mary; the Rosary.

§ 1. How great a load of rites and ceremonies weighed religion down in this century, appears abundantly from the acts of councils holden in England, France, Germany, and Italy. The many new citizens, who were daily received, like supernumeraries, into heaven, required new festal days, new forms of worship, and new religious rites. And in excogitating these, the priests, though dull and slow in everything besides, were wonderfully ingenious. Some of their arrangements flowed from the erroneous opinions on sacred and secular subjects, which the barbarous nations derived from their ancestors, and incorporated with Christianity. Nor did such as directed sacred things oppose these customs, but thought all their duty fully done, when they had either honoured with some Christian forms what was in itself base and worthless, or had found for it some allegorical and far-fetched meaning. Several customs, which notwithstanding passed as eminently sacred, came from men's foolish notions of God, and of heavenly spirits. For people fancied that God and his friends must feel just as earthly kings and nobles do; whose favour may be gained by gifts and presents, and who delight in frequent salutations and external marks of honour.

§ 2. Near the end of this century, in the year 998, by the influence of *Odilo*, abbot of Cluny, the number of festal days among the Latins was augmented, by the dedication of one annually to commemorate *all departed souls*. Before this time, it had been the custom in many places to offer prayers, on certain days, for the souls in purgatory: but these prayers were offered only for the friends and patrons of a particular religious order or society. *Odilo's* piety was not to be thus limited; he wished to extend this kindness to all the departed souls that were suffering in the invisible world.¹

¹ See Jo. Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* [tom. viii. or] sæcul. vi. pt. i. p. 584; where he gives the life of *Odilo*, and his decree instituting this new festival. [The story of the hermit is differently related. One says, the hermit stated, that wandering near

mount Etna, he overheard the souls burning in that volcano relate the benefits they received from the prayers of *Odilo*. Another represents the hermit as saying, simply, it was divinely revealed to him. One likewise represents the hermit as stating, that all the

The author of the suggestion was a Sicilian recluse, or hermit, who caused it to be stated to *Odilo*, that he had learned from a divine revelation, that the souls in purgatory might be released by the prayers of the *Cluniac monks*.¹ At first, therefore, this was only a private regulation of the *society at Cluny*: but a Roman pontiff, — who he was is unknown, — approved the institution, and ordered it to be everywhere observed.

§ 3. The worship of the virgin *Mary*, which previously had been extravagant, was in this century carried much farther than before. Not to mention other things less certain, I observe first, that near the close of this century, the custom became prevalent among the Latins, of celebrating masses, and abstaining from flesh, on Saturdays, in honour of *St. Mary*. In the next place, the daily *office of St. Mary*, which the Latins call the *lesser office*, was introduced; and it was afterwards confirmed by *Urban II.* in the council of Clermont. Lastly, pretty distinct traces of the *Rosary* and *Crown of St. Mary*, as they are called, or of praying according to a numerical arrangement, are to be found in this century. For they who tell us that *St. Dominic* invented the *Rosary* in the thirteenth century, do not offer satisfactory proof of their opinion.² The *Rosary* consisted of fifteen repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and one hundred and fifty salutations of *St. Mary*: and what the Latins called the *Crown of St. Mary*, consisted of six or seven repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and sixty or seventy salutations, according to the age ascribed by different authors to the holy virgin.

souls in purgatory enjoyed *respite*, two days each week, namely, Mondays and Tuesdays. Another says, he represented, that several souls had been *released* entirely from purgatory by his prayers. And another, that many souls *might* be released, &c. See Mabillon, l. c. p. 666, 701 (ed. Paris, 1701), and Fleury, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, l. lix. § 57. All agree that the hermit made his representation to a French monk, then on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and bade him acquaint *Odilo* with it, which was accordingly done. *Tr.* — 'Sigebertus auctor est, Odilonem hoc anno (998) commemorationem omnium defunctorum secunda die Novembris instituisse in suo monasterio, cujus exemplo ad ceteras ecclesias hæc institutio permanavit, tametsi jam in nonnullis monasteriis Ordinis nostri, sed alia die, recepta erat. Id ab Odilone factum dicitur hortatu cujusdam in Sicilia reclusi, qui defunctorum animas a piacularibus flammis Cluniacensium eleemosynis et precibus eripi contestatus est cuidam viro religioso Ierosolymis revertenti, idque Odiloni abbati renunciari curavit.' (Mabillon, *Annall. Ord. Bened.* iv. 125.) *Odilo*, who was of knightly origin in Auvergne, was pretty

nearly at the head of superstition, in his age, so deeply smitten with it. He was complimented as the *brightest mirror* placed by God in the world, 'quem Deus clarissimum speculum in mundo posuit,' and the *standard-bearer of all religion*, 'ille totius religionis signifer Odilo.' When at Rome, he was the great mark of admiration, seeming really to be, as he was occasionally called, the *archangel of monks*, 're vera putares esse archangelum monachorum.' He died in 1049 (*Ibid.* 352, 109, 239, 499). The tenth and eleventh centuries hardly wanted such a man for riveting the Platonic belief in purgatory. *S.]*

¹ Pope Benedict XIV., or Prosper Lambertini, in his treatise *de Festis Jesu Christi, Mariæ, et Sanctorum*, lib. iii. c. 22, *Opp.* x. 671, very wisely observes silence respecting this obscure and disreputable origin of that anniversary; and thus shows us what he thought of it. And in this work of Benedict XIV. are many specimens of the author's discernment.

² This is formally demonstrated by Jo. Mabillon, *Pref. ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.* sæcul. v. p. lviii. &c.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF HERESIES.

§ 1. The more ancient heresies — § 2. The Paulicians — § 3. Commotions excited by Leuthard — § 4. The Anthropomorphites.

§ 1. THE incredible stupidity of this age, which was the source of so many evils, had this one advantage, that it rendered the church tranquil, and undisturbed by new sects and discords. The Nestorians and Monophysites began to experience more hardships under the Arabians, than formerly : and they are said to have repeatedly suffered the greatest violence. But as many of them gained the good will of the great, by their skill in medicine, or by their abilities as stewards and men of business, the persecutions that occasionally broke out, were in some sort suppressed.¹

§ 2. The Manichæans or Paulicians, of whom mention has been made before, became considerably numerous in Thrace under the emperor *John Tzimiscēs*. As early as the eighth century *Constantine Copronymus* had removed a large portion of this sect to this province, that they might no longer disturb the tranquillity of the East : yet they still remained numerous in Syria and the neighbouring countries. *Theodorus*, therefore, the bishop of Antioch, for the safety of his own flock, did not cease importuning the emperor, until he ordered a new colony of Manichæans to be transplanted to Philippopolis.² From Thrace, the sect removed into Bulgaria and Slavonia ; in which countries they afterwards had a supreme pontiff of their own ; and they made a regular home there down to the times of the council of Bâle, or to the fifteenth century. From Bulgaria, they migrated to Italy ; and thence spread into other countries of Europe, and gave much trouble to the Roman pontiffs.³

§ 3. At the close of this century, a certain man of low condition, named *Leuthard*, in the village of Vertus near Châlons, attempted some innovations in religion ; and, in a short time, drew a large share of the vulgar after him. He would allow of no images ; for he is said to have broken the image of our Saviour. He maintained that tithes ought not to be given to the priests ; and said, that in the

¹ [Some Nestorians were private secretaries of the Khalifs ; and the Nestorian patriarch had such influence with the Khalif, that the Jacobite and Greek bishops, living among the Arabians, were obliged, in their difficulties, to put themselves under his protection. See *Asseman, Biblioth. Orient.*

Vatic. iv. 96—100. *Schl.*]

² Jo. Zonaras, *Annal.* l. xvii. p. 209, ed. Paris ; p. 164, ed. Venice.

³ And, as has been already observed, perhaps some remains of the sect still exist in Bulgaria.

prophecies of the Old Testament, some things were true, and some things were false. He pretended to be inspired; but bishop *Gelwin* drove the man to extremities, and he at last threw himself into a well.¹ I suppose, that the disciples of this man, who doubtless taught many other things, besides those which are stated above, joined themselves with such as were afterwards, in France, called *Albigenses*, and who are said to have leaned to the views of the Manichæans.

§ 4. Some remains of the Arians still existed in certain parts of Italy; and especially in the region about Padua.² *Ratherius*, bishop of Verona, had a controversy with the *Anthropomorphites*, from the year 939, onwards. For in the neighbourhood of Vicenza, there were many persons, not only among the laity, but also among the clergy, who supposed that God possesses a human form, and sits upon a golden throne, in the manner of kings; and that his ministers, or *angels*, are winged men, clothed in white robes.³ These erroneous conceptions will not surprise us, if we reflect, that the people, who were extremely ignorant on all subjects, and especially on religion, saw God and the angels so painted, everywhere, in the churches. More irrational still was the superstition of those, whom the same *Ratherius* opposes; who were led, I know not how, to believe that *St. Michael* says mass, every Monday, before God in heaven; and they therefore resorted, on these days, to the churches that were

¹ An account of these transactions is given by Glaber Radulphus, *Hist.* l. ii. c. xi. [Fleury, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, l. lviii. § 19, thus relates the whole story, on the authority of Glaber. Near the close of the year 1000, a plebeian of the name of Leutard, in the village of Vertus and diocese of Châlons, pretended to be a prophet, and deceived many. Being at a certain time in the fields, and fatigued with labour, he laid himself down to sleep; when a great swarm of bees seemed to enter the lower part of his body, and to pass out of his mouth, with a great buzzing. They next began to sting him severely; and after tormenting him awhile, they spoke to him, and commanded him to do some things which were beyond human power. He returned home exhausted; and, with a view to obey the divine admonition, dismissed his wife. Then proceeding to the church, as if for prayer, he entered it, and seized and broke the image of the crucifix. The bystanders were amazed, and supposed the man was deranged; but as they were simple rustics, he easily persuaded them that he had performed the deed under the direction of a supernatural and divine revelation. Leutard talked much, and wished to be regarded as a great teacher. But in his discourses there was nothing solid, and no truth. He said that the things taught by the prophets were to be believed only in part; and that the rest was useless. He declared that it was of no use to a man to

pay his tithes. Fame now proclaimed him to be a man of God; and no small part of the vulgar went after him. But Gelwin, the venerable and wise bishop of Châlons, summoned the man before him, and interrogated him respecting all the things reported of him. He began to dissemble and conceal the poison of his wickedness, and quoted portions of the Scriptures, which he had never studied. The sagacious bishop now convicted the blockhead of falsehood and madness; and, in part, reclaimed the people whom he had seduced. The wretched Leutard, finding his reputation ruined among the people, drowned himself in a well. *Tr.*]

² [In the diocese of Peter, the bishop of Padua, who died A.D. 942, there were many Arians, whom that bishop strenuously opposed. Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, v. 429 (new edition). And in the same work, p. 433, it is stated, that bishop Goslin or Gauslin, who filled the see from 964 till into the following century, completely exterminated this sect. *Schl.*]

³ [We ought not to class these poor creatures among heretics. The language of *Ratherius* does not imply that such opinions were taught in public. The erroneous views entertained by individuals in private, do not constitute a heresy. And how many such *Anthropomorphites* should we not now find, if we were to examine the conceptions of our own common people, in regard to God and the angels? *Schl.*]

dedicated to St. Michael.¹ It is probable, that the priests, who performed service in the temples consecrated to St. Michael, instilled, from avarice, this most absurd notion, as they did other errors, into the minds of the vulgar.

¹ Ratherius, *Epistola Synodica*, in Dacherii *Spicileg. Scriptor. Veter.* ii. 294, &c. Sigebert of Gemblours, *Chronol.* ad ann. 939.

POPES, OR BISHOPS OF ROME,*

DURING THE FIRST TEN CENTURIES.

Name	Accession	Death
	A.D.	A.D.
LINUS ¹	66	78
Anencletus, or Cletus ²	78	91
Clement	91	100
Evaristus	100	109
Alexander	109	119
Sixtus	119	128
Telesphorus	128	139
Hyginus	139	142
Pius	142	157
Anicetus	157	168
Soter ³	168	176
Eleutherus	176	192
Victor	192	201
Zephyrinus	201	218

* By MR. SOAMES.

¹ St. Peter passes among Romanists for the first bishop of Rome, but the church there seems really to have been settled by that apostle in conjunction with St. Paul; and Linus appointed its bishop by their joint authority, probably on their departure to evangelize other places. '*Nam Irenæus, a quo hanc Romanæ successionis tabulam primo accepimus, originem ejus clare a duobus Apostolis, SS. Petro et Paulo, arcessit. Sic enim ille, Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν, καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Ἰνὼφ τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχέρησαν, Fundantes igitur et instruentes beati Apostoli ecclesiam, Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt; ut habet vetus interpres, lib. iii. cap. 3. Quinam autem hi Apostoli fuerint, idem paulo ante indicat, dum dicit se non omnium ecclesiarum successiones enumerare velle, sed unius tantum, maximè et antiquissimæ, et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis Apostolis, Petro et Paulo, Romæ fundatæ, et constitutæ ecclesiæ.*' Bp. Pearson, *de Serie (et Successione Primorum Romæ Episcoporum*. Lond. 1687, p. 28). Epiphanius treats the apostles Peter and Paul as joint bishops of Rome, 'οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, *videm Apostoli et Episcopi.*' Thus, although the temporary supervision of St. Peter over the Roman church can hardly be controverted,

his single, that is, proper episcopate there, labours under insurmountable difficulties; and it is more reasonable to consider Linus, the nominee of himself and St. Paul conjointly, as really the first bishop of Rome.

² Anencletus, or Anacletus, usually stands in the fourth place after Clement, and Cletus, in the second, after Linus; but the two names appear unquestionably to denote one prelate, who claims the second place, and whom De Valois reasonably conjectures to have been popularly called Cletus. Pearson, 146.

³ The chronology exhibited here is that of Bower, in his *History of the Popes*. It was thought sufficiently accurate for ordinary reference. But Bp. Pearson, in his dissertation, *de Annis Primorum Romæ Episcoporum* (p. 168, 224, 270, 274, 311, 316), maintains, with his usual learning, a different system. He considers Linus to have been bishop from 55 to 67; Anencletus, from 67 to 69; Clement, from 69 to 83; Evaristus, from 83 to 91; Alexander, from 91 to 101; Sixtus, or Xystus, from 101 to 111; Telesphorus, from 111 to 122; Hyginus, from 122 to 126; Pius, from 127 to 142; Anicetus, from 142 to 161; Soter, from 161 to 170. Dodwell contends that Pearson is mistaken as to Anicetus and Soter; the former having really died in 153, the latter in 162.

Name	Accession	Death
Callistus	219	223
Urbanus	223	230
Pontianus	230	235
Anterus	235	236
Fabianus	236	250
Cornelius	251	252
Lucius	252	252
Stephen	253	257
Sixtus II. . . .	257	258
Dionysius	259	269
Felix	269	274
Eutychianus	275	283
Caius	283	296
Marcellianus	296	304
Marcellus	308	310
Eusebius	310	310
Melchiades	311	314
Sylvester	314	335
Mark	336	336
Julius	337	352
Liberius	352	366
Damasus	366	384
Syricius	384	398
Anastasius	398	402
Innocent	402	417
Zosimus	417	418
Boniface	419	422
Celestine	422	432
Sixtus III. . . .	432	440
Leo the Great	440	461
Hilarus	461	468
Simplicius	468	483
Felix II. . . .	483	492
Gelasius	492	496
Anastasius II. . . .	496	498
Symmachus	498	514
Hormisdas	July 20, 514	Aug. 6, 523
John	Aug. 13, 523	May 18, 526
Felix III. . . .	July 12, 526	Sept. 15, 530
Boniface II. . . .	Sept. 22, 530	Oct. 17, 532
John II. . . .	Dec. 31, 532	May 27, 535
Agapetus	June 3, 535	Ap. 22, 536
Silverius ¹	June 8, 536	June 20, 538
Vigilius	Mar. 29, 537	June 7, 555
Pelagius	June —, 555	Mar. 31, 560
John III. . . .	July 14, 560	July —, 573

¹ Silverius was deposed by Belisarius, then besieged in Rome by the Goths, under a charge of conspiracy to betray the city to them. He was really the victim of the empress Theodora's enmity. By means of that princess, Vigilius was intruded into his see,

and he was himself banished from Rome. He died a prisoner at Palmeruolo, an uninhabited island off the Latin coast. Some reckon the accession of Vigilius from his deposition, others from his death. Bower, ii. 363, 368.

Name	Accession	Death
Benedict . . .	June 3, 574	July 31, 578
Pelagius II. . . .	Nov. 27, 578	Jan. 8, 590
Gregory the Great . . .	Sept. 3, 590	Mar. 12, 604
Sabinian	Sept. 13, 604	Feb. 22, 606
Boniface III. . . .	Feb. 19, 607	Nov. 12, 607
Boniface IV. . . .	Sept. 15, 608	May 25, 615
Deusdedit	Oct. 19, 615	Nov. 8, 618
Boniface V. . . .	Dec. 23, 619	Oct. 25, 625
Honorius	Nov. 3, 625	Oct. 12, 638
Severinus ¹	May 28, 640	Aug. 2, 640
John IV. . . .	Dec. 24, 640	Oct. 12, 642
Theodore	Nov. 24, 642	May 13, 649
Martin	July 5, 649	Sept. 16, 655
Eugenius ²	Aug. 10, 654	June 3, 657
Vitalian	July 30, 657	Jan. 27, 672
Adeodatus	Ap. 11, 672	June 16, 676
Donus	Nov. 2, 676	Ap. 11, 678
Agatho	June 27, 678	Jan. 10, 682
Leo II. . . .	Aug. 17, 682	July 3, 683
Benedict II. . . .	June 26, 684	May 7, 685
John V. . . .	July 23, 685	Aug. 2, 686
Conon	Oct. 21, 686	Sept. 22, 687
Sergius	Dec. 15, 687	Sept. 7, 701
John VI. . . .	Oct. 30, 701	Jan. 9, 705
John VII. . . .	Mar. 1, 705	Oct. 17, 707
Sisinnius	Jan. 18, 708	Feb. 6, 708
Constantine	Mar. 25, 708	Ap. 8, 715
Gregory II. . . .	May 19, 715	Feb. 11, 731
Gregory III. . . .	Mar. 18, 731	Nov. 29, 741
Zachary	Dec. 3, 741	Mar. 14, 752
Stephen II. . . .	Mar. 26, 752	Ap. 26, 757
Paul	May 29, 757	June 28, 767
Stephen III. . . .	Aug. 7, 768	Feb. 1, 772
Hadrian	Feb. 9, 772	Dec. 25, 795
Leo III. . . .	Dec. 27, 795	June 11, 816
Stephen IV. . . .	June 22, 816	Jan. 24, 817
Paschal	Jan. 25, 817	May —, 824
Eugenius II. . . .	May —, 824	Aug. —, 827
Valentine ³	— 827	— 827
Gregory IV. . . .	— 827	Jan. 25, 844
Sergius II. . . .	Feb. 10, 844	Jan. 27, 847
Leo IV. ⁴	Ap. 10, 847	July 17, 855
Benedict III. . . .	Sept. 29, 855	Ap. 7, 858

¹ Severinus 'was elected soon after the death of his predecessor, but not ordained till the 28th of May, 640, when the see had been vacant one year, seven months, and seventeen days.' He could not earlier obtain the emperor's ratification of his election. Bower, iii. 21, 22.

² Eugenius was elected on the deposition of Martin under imperial authority. It is, therefore, questionable whether his pontificate should be dated from his predecessor's

death or deposition.

³ 'Chosen, as is commonly supposed, after a few days' vacancy. Valentine enjoyed his new dignity but a very short time; according to some, scarce one month, according to others, forty days.' Bower, iv. 219, 220.

⁴ This pope has been canonised, and is consequently known as St. Leo. He appears to have been a very excellent person. His successor, according to mediæval legends, was *Pope Joan*.

Name	Accession	Death
Nicolas	Ap. 24, 858	Nov. 13, 867
Hadrian II. . . .	Dec. 14, 867	Nov. 26, 872
John VIII. . . .	Dec. 14, 872	Dec. 15, 882
Marinus ¹	Dec. —, 882	May —, 884
Hadrian III. ²	May —, 884	Sept. —, 885
Stephen V. ³	Sept. —, 885	Sept. —, 891
Formosus ⁴	Sept. —, 891	May 23, 896
Boniface VI. ⁵	May —, 896	June —, 896
Stephen VI. ⁶	June —, 896	July —, 897
Romanus ⁷	July —, 897	Nov. —, 897
Theodore II. ⁸	— 897	— 898
John IX. ⁹	June —, 898	July —, 900
Benedict IV. ¹⁰	July —, 900	Aug. —, 903
Leo V. ¹¹	Aug. —, 903	Sept. —, 903
Christopher ¹²	Oct. —, 903	Jan. —, 904
Sergius III. ¹³	Jan. 29, 904	Sept. —, 911
Anastasius III. ¹⁴	Sept. —, 911	Nov. —, 913
Lando ¹⁵	Nov. —, 913	May —, 914
John X. ¹⁶	May 15, 914	— 929

¹ 'Called by some Martin II.—If he was chosen and ordained a few days after the death of pope John, in December, 882, as we are told he was, and held the see one year and five months, his death must have happened in May, 884.' Bower, v. 57, 58.

² 'He was chosen and ordained, so far as we can conjecture from the duration of his pontificate, in the latter end of May, or the beginning of June, 884.—If Hadrian held the see one year and four months, as we read in most of the catalogues of the popes, his death must have happened about the month of September, 885.' *Ibid.* 52, 60.

³ 'That Stephen governed the Roman church nine years, and should be called, not the sixth, but the fifth of that name, appears from his epitaph.' *Ibid.* 65.

⁴ 'He is the first that was translated from another see to that of Rome, the preceding popes having been all chosen from among the presbyters and deacons of that church.' *Ibid.* 66.

⁵ He is said by the continuator of the *Annals of Fulda*, who lived at this time, to have died of the gout at the end of fifteen days. As he held the see so short a time, and intruded himself into it by open force, Baronius, and after him some other writers, have not allowed him a place among the popes.' *Ibid.* 72.

⁶ Stephen is known to have been pope before Aug. 20, 896, and Romanus, in October, 897.' *Ibid.* 75.

⁷ 'If he held the see but three months and twenty-two days, he must have died about the end of January, 898.' *Ibid.* 76.

⁸ 'He held the see but twenty days.' *Ibid.* 76.

⁹ 'John IX. held the see, according to

the most probable opinion, two years and fifteen days, and must, consequently, have died about the beginning of August, 900, it being manifest from some of his letters, that he was in possession of the see in July, 898.' *Ibid.* 79.

¹⁰ Benedict died, according to the most probable opinion, about the beginning of October, 903.' *Ibid.* 84.

¹¹ 'He was driven out of the see, and put into prison, after about a month's possession. He is said to have died of grief in prison.' *Ibid.* 85.

¹² 'All we know of him is, that he intruded himself into the see by open force and violence, that he treated his predecessor with great barbarity, and confirmed all the privileges that his predecessors had granted to the famous abbey of Corbie. The diploma confirming these privileges is dated *VII. Cal. Jan. Indict. VII.*, that is, the 25th of December, 903. Christopher, therefore, had seized on the see before the 25th of December of the present year. But he held it, as we read in Martinus Polonus, in Flodoard, and in most of the catalogues, only six, or at most seven, months.' *Ibid.* 85.

¹³ 'As he was ordained about the beginning of June, 904, his death must have happened about the end of August, 911.' *Ibid.* 87.

¹⁴ 'Anastasius died, according to the computation of the best chronologers, about the middle of Oct. 913.' *Ibid.* 89.

¹⁵ 'Held the see, as we read in Flodoard, only six months and ten days.' *Ibid.*

¹⁶ 'He held the see, according to Flodoard, fourteen months, and somewhat more, and consequently must have died in June or

Name	Official Designation	Accession	Death
Leo VI. ¹	—	July —, 928	Feb. —, 929
Stephen VII. ²	—	Feb. —, 929	Mar. —, 931
John XI. ³	—	Mar. —, 931	Jan. —, 936
Leo VII. ⁴	—	Jan. —, 936	July —, 939
Stephen VIII. ⁵	—	July —, 939	Oct. —, 942
Marinus II. ⁶	—	Oct. —, 942	Ap. —, 946
Agapetus II. ⁷	—	Ap. —, 946	Nov. —, 955
Octavian ⁸	John XII.	Nov. —, 955	May 14, 964
Leo VIII.	—	Dec. 6, 963	Mar. —, 965
Benedict V.	—	May —, 964	July 4, 965
John XIII.	—	Oct. 1, 965	Sept. 6, 972
Benedict VI. ⁹	—	Jan. 19, 973	July —, 974
Donus II. ¹⁰	—	—	—
Benedict VII.	—	Oct. —, 974	Oct. —, 983
Peter ¹¹	John XIV.	Dec. —, 983	Aug. 20, 984
John XV.	—	Sept. —, 985	Ap. —, 996
Bruno	Gregory V.	May 3, 996	Feb. 18, 999
Gerbert	Silvester II.	Ap. 2, 999	May 12, 1003

PRINCIPAL COUNCILS.

	A.D.		A.D.
ILLIBERIS ¹²	305	Laodicea	320
Arles	314	NICE (First)	325
Ancyra	314	Gangra	325
Neo-Cæsarea	314	Antioch	341

July, 928.—John X. is the first pope that was seen at the head of an army.' Bower, v. 95.

¹ 'All we read of him in Flodoard, who lived in those days, is, that he succeeded John X. and governed the church seven months and five days.' *Ibid.*

² 'He must have died about the 15th of March, 931.' *Ibid.* 96.

³ He was intruded into the see when very young, and died in prison about 936. *Ibid.* 97.

⁴ He is thought to have died about July, 939. *Ibid.* 99.

⁵ He died about the close of 942. *Ibid.* 104.

⁶ Otherwise Martin III. He seems to have died in June, 946. *Ibid.* 102.

⁷ Ordained before June 22, 946. He retained the see above ten years. *Ibid.* 102, 104.

⁸ 'He took the name of John, that of his uncle, pope John XI., and he is the first pope that changed his name.' He was intruded into the see when about eighteen, and eventually deposed. *Ibid.* 104, 111.

⁹ He was ordained after Nov. 28, 972,

and was strangled in prison about two years afterwards by a popular leader who had gained the upper hand in Rome. *Ibid.* 122, 123.

¹⁰ 'Hermannus Contractus does not reckon Donus among the popes; but he is by all other writers placed in their catalogues immediately after Benedict VI.' *Ibid.* 123.

¹¹ 'He exchanged' (his name) 'on his promotion, for that of John, out of respect for the prince of the apostles. He held the see only eight months.' *Ibid.* 125.

¹² As it has been thought material only to note such councils as are of some prominence in ecclesiastical history, and have left canons upon record, that of Illiberis was first selected. Neither the place, nor the time in which it sat, has passed unquestioned. The former, however, it is generally believed, was at a city, once episcopal, but now wholly ruined, built on Mount Elvira, where its traces are still discernible, about seven miles from Granada, in Spain. The date adopted is that given in Labbe and Cossart's *Councils*; which have been followed for all the other dates.

	A.D.		A.D.
Sardica	347	Rheims	627
CONSTANTINOPLE	381	Toledo	633
Carthage	397	Toledo	638
Carthage	398	Lateran	649
Toledo	400	Chalons	650
Milevis	416	Merida	666
EPHESUS	431	Hertford	673
CHALCEDON ¹	451	Toledo	675
Rome	502	Braga	675
Agde	506	Hatfield	680
Orleans	511	CONSTANTINOPLE ³	681
Tarragona	516	Quinisext, or Trullan	692
Gerona	517	Toledo	693
Epone	517	Bapchild	694
Lerida	524	Toledo	694
Valencia	524	Berghamsted	696
Arles	524	Rome	721
Orange	529	Rome	743
Vaison	529	Soissons	744
Toledo	531	Cloveshoo	747
Orleans	533	Verberie	752
Clermont in Auvergne	535	Metz	753
Orleans	538	Vernon	755
Barcelona	540	Compeigne	757
Orleans	541	Calcuith	787
Orleans	549	NICE II. ⁴	787
CONSTANTINOPLE ²	553	Friuli	791
Arles	554	Frankfort	794
Paris	557	Arles	813
Braga	563	Mentz	813
Tours	567	Rheims	813
Braga	572	Tours	813
Auxerre	578	Chalons	813
Mâcon	581	Constantinople	814
Lyons	583	Aix-la-Chapelle	816
Mâcon	585	Cealchyth	816
Toledo	589	Paris ⁵	824
Narbonne	589	Paris	829

¹ The capitals denote Œcumenical or General Councils. In strict accuracy, perhaps none such were ever holden: means of exhibiting, in a deliberative assembly, the universal voice of Christendom being, in fact, unattainable. But in the first four General Councils, as they are called, the Roman empire, which was far the largest and most enlightened portion of the Christian church, may be fairly considered as judicially deciding some of the most important questions in theology. These four councils, accordingly, have been for ages the received standard of orthodoxy. Upon their decisions rest such views of Scriptural truth as guard a belief in the Holy Trinity. From them theologians have learned to define the

Catholic faith, and neither Protestant nor Romanist questions their authority. A position so commanding can be taken by no other council.

² Termed the second of Constantinople, and the *Fifth General*.

³ Termed the third of Constantinople, and the *Sixth General*.

⁴ Termed by Romanists the *Seventh General*. By establishing image-worship, it fixed upon their church its peculiar character.

⁵ This council Labbe and Cossart mention, but will not admit as really entitled to the name of a council. It was called by the Frankish king, Lewis the Pious, in furtherance of Michael the Stammerer's

	A.D.		A.D.
Aix-la-Chapelle	836	Cologne	887
Thionville	844	Mentz	888
Vernon	844	Metz	888
Beauvais	845	Vienne	892
Meaux	845	Tribur ²	895
Mentz	847	Rome	904
Pavia	850	Trosly	909
Soissons	853	Grately	928
Valence	855	London	943
Savonières, near Toul. (<i>Conc.</i>		Ingelheim	948
<i>Tullense apud Saponarias</i>) .	859	Andover	961
Worms	868	Wihthordestane ³	962
CONSTANTINOPLE IV. ¹ .	869	Winchester	968
Pontyon	876	Kirtlington	977
Ravenna	877	Calne	978
Troyes	878	Amesbury	978
Fismes	881	Ravenna	997

ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

Name	Appointment	Death
Augustine	Nov. 16, 597	May 26, 604
Laurence ⁴	— 604	Feb. 2, 619
Mellitus	— 619	Ap. 24, 624
Justus	— 624	Nov. 10, 627
Honorius	— 627	Sept. 30, 653
Deusdedit ⁵	Mar. 26, 655	July 14, 664
Theodore	Mar. 26, 668	Sept. 19, 690
Brihtwald	June 29, 693	Jan. 9, 731
Tatwin	June 10, 731	July 30, 734
Nothelm	— 736	Oct. 17, 740
Cuthbert	— 740	Oct. 26, 758
Bregwin	Sept. 29, 759	Aug. 25, 765
Lambert	Feb. 2, 766	Aug. 11, 790
Athelard	July 21, 793	May 12, 805
Wulfred	— 805	Mar. 24, 832

opposition to image-worship. The Constantinopolitan emperor, having made a decree against this pernicious superstition, was anxious to obtain concurrence in it from pope Eugenius, and thought himself more likely to succeed if he could back his application by one from the Frankish monarch. Lewis accordingly convoked his prelate at Paris, and this body affirmed the principles that had already been sanctioned at Frankfurt, but Eugenius *persisted in the ancient and apostolical tradition*: a shrewd resolve secure of popular ratification. Cabassut, *Notitia Ecclesiastica*, p. 319.

¹ The *Eighth General*.

² Tribur was on the Rhine, between

Oppenheim and Mentz. It has long been ruined. Binius, *apud* Labb. et Coss. *Conc.* lib. ix. p. 467.

³ The site of this English council has not been ascertained; nor is it noticed, any more than that of Andover, in editions of the councils. A record of them both, however, remains in the British Museum. See Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 188, 295, 3rd ed. 191, 304.

⁴ Consecrated as his successor by Augustine.

⁵ An Anglo-Saxon, whose real name was Erithona. Godwin, *de Præsull.* Cantab. 1743, p. 40.

Name	Appointment	Death
Feologeld	June 9, 832	Aug. 29, 832
Ceolnoth	Aug. 27, 833	Feb. 4, 870
Ethelred	— 870	June 30, 889
Plegmund	— 890	Aug. 2, 914
Athelm	— 914	Jan. 8, 923
Wulfhelm	— 923	Feb. 12, 942
Odo	— 942	June 2, 958
Elsin	— 959	— 959
Dunstan	— 959	May 19, 988
Ethelgar	— 988	Dec. 3, 989
Sigeric	— 990	Oct. 28, 994
Ælfrie	— 994	Nov. 16, 1006

ARCHBISHOPS OF ARMAGH.

	A.D.		A.D.
Senach ¹	598	Artrigius	822
Mac-Laisir	610	Eugene Monaster	833
Thomian	623	Faranan	834
Segene	661	Dermod O Tigernach	848
Flan-Febla	688	Factna	852
Suibhney ²	715	Ainmire	874
Congusa	730	Catasach Mac-Rabartach	875
Celle-Peter ³	750	Mælcob Mac-Crumvail	883
Ferdachry	758	Mæl-Brigid Mac-Dornan	885
Foendelach	768	Joseph	927
Dubdalethy I.	778	Mæl-Patrick Mac-Maoltule	936
Affiat	793	Catasach II. Mac-Dulgen	937
Cudniscus	794	Muredach Mac-Fergus	957
Connmach	798	Dubdalethy II. Mac-Kellach	966
Torbach Mac-Gorman	807	Murechan	998
Nuad Mac-Segene	808	Mælmury, or Marian	1001
Flanguss Mac-Loingle	812		

¹ St. Patrick heads the series, which descends regularly from him, but there is little certainty in it before the seventh century; perhaps, not so soon.

² 'Or Suivney.' *The Whole Works of Sir James Ware, concerning Ireland*, Dublin.

1739, i. 40.—This name is evidently the *Sweeney* of modern Ireland.

³ 'Or *Petricola*, a servant of Peter's, the word *Ceile* signifying a *servant*.' Ware, i. 41.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.

NEW-STREET SQUARE

